UNIVERSITY OF Hull

Department of Politics and International Studies

Module Handbook
2011/12

Is There A Limit? Violence and Crime on the Internet

Module No:	**30208**
Level:	7
Semester:	2
Credit Value:	20
Module Leader:	Prof. Raphael Cohen-Almagor
Pre-requisites:	None
Co-requisites:	None
Post-requisites:	None
Anti-requisites:	None
Total Contact:	11 x 2 hour weekly seminars

Assessment: Seminar Participation (10%);
PowerPoint (30%);
Final paper of 4000 words (60%)

Staff contact: ((Tel) 01482 465024
(Email) R.Cohen-Almagor@hull.ac.uk
(Web) http://ebridge.hull.ac.uk/

This handbook is available in alternative formats on request from the Department

CONTENTS

PLEASE NOTE: The Department of Politics and International Studies operate a policy of continuous quality enhancement, reflecting on the previous year's practice and specific feedback such as that gained through the Staff/Student Committee, to ensure that it provides the highest quality student experience possible. As a consequence we review, and where necessary revise our policies on a yearly basis. Where this has resulted in a change in the

Department's regulations year this will be indicated by a in the margin of this handbook.

1.   GENERAL OUTLINE AND AIMS OF THE MODULE

The module explores possible boundaries to Internet freedom of expression. Attention will be given to examples taken from the United States, Canada, and United Kingdom. We will touch upon controversial expressions such as racism; hate speech; true threats; incitement; crime facilitating speech; terrorism on the Internet and its impact on our lives. We will probe dilemmas and responsibilities of Net users, readers, ISPs, the state and the international community at large. The module will combine theory with case studies.

2.   LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of the module students should:

- be able to think critically about the Internet
- understand relevant concepts: Internet architecture, hate, Holocaust denial, terror, crime facilitating speech, media accountability.
- critically examine the relationships between ethics, responsibility, and the New media
- have a good knowledge of specific cases which illustrate the challenges we face on the Internet.

⚠ **PLEASE NOTE: the following sections should be read in conjunction with Departmental Undergraduate Handbook, the relevant University Programme Regulations and the University Student Handbooks.**
For Programme Regulations see:
http://www.hull.ac.uk/policyregister/qualityhandbook/section_b/B04.doc
The Student Handbook is available at: http://student.hull.ac.uk/handbook/.

⚠ **It is your responsibility to ensure that you are fully acquainted with all of the requirements set out in this handbook and in the associated documentation.**

3.   METHOD OF TEACHING

Teaching will be by way of weekly seminars conducted by Professor Cohen-Almagor.
.

Attendance at ALL CLASSES is compulsory and will be monitored accordingly. Failure to attend compulsory classes is a disciplinary offence. **Students are also required to attend punctually**. Students who arrive ten or more minutes after the scheduled start of a class will be marked as absent, though they will be permitted to remain in the class and to participate.

Students should be aware that, under Paragraph 33(a) of the University's *Programmes Regulations - Honours Degrees,* a student who has not met the specified module requirements relating to attendance may be denied the right of re-assessment in that module. Persistent non-attendance may, in accordance with Paragraph 35(a), result in exclusion from assessment and/or termination of a student's programme of study.

4.   MODULE ASSESSMENT

⚠ The regulations regarding module assessment set out in this handbook **must** be strictly adhered to. Failure to comply with the regulations, including failure to accurately provide information required by the regulations, may result in the award of a mark of zero. The right of reassessment may also be denied. All such cases will be considered by the Department's Academic Progress Committee (DAPC).

4.1   Essay plans and draft essays

In order to ensure equity, students may submit an essay plan, consisting of headings and sub-headings, of no more than one side of A4 paper. Alternatively students may discuss with tutors the broad plan of their essay. **Tutors will not comment on draft essays**. Please note that the purpose of submitting an essay plan or discussing an essay is to gain advice on *essay content*. Students concerned about essay preparation and writing skills (e.g. footnoting, bibliography, use of English etc.) should refer back to the Department's study skills programme and/or seek advice from the University's Study Advice Service. (For further details see **www.hull.ac.uk/studyadvice**)

4.2   Essay Submission

⚠ The submission of an essay, as defined in the Programme Handbook, constitutes part of the formal assessment of this module. If you do not submit an essay and fail the module the DAPC may, irrespective of whether failure was due to non-submission of the essay, recommend to the Module Board that you be denied the right of reassessment.

All assessed coursework must be submitted using '*turnitinUK*', an anti-plagiarism software package. This software compares essays against a number of sources and produces a report indicating the extent to which the essay matches these sources. Markers are then required to consider the matches indicated to ensure that, where the work of others has been used, it has been appropriately referenced.

Use of *turnitinUK* requires electronic submission of essays. Consequently, **you must complete a two stage submission process, submitting an electronic copy AND a hard copy of your essay. Until you have completed both of these stages you will be deemed not to have satisfied the submission requirements**. It is your responsibility to ensure that you leave yourself sufficient time to complete the whole submission process.

Firstly, you must **submit an electronic copy of your essay**. Instructions on how to do this, including on how to acquire a *turnitinUK* 'paper ID number' verifying your essay submission are provided below. You must follow them carefully. **You will not be able to submit the hard copy of your essay without the relevant *turnitinUK* 'paper ID number'**.

- To submit the electronic copy of your essay you should proceed as follows:
    - Go to http://www.submit.ac.uk
    - Click <User Login>
    - Log in by entering your *university* email address and the *turnitinUK* password which has been emailed to your *university* email account by *turnitinUK*.
    - This will take you to your *turnitinUK* homepage, on which are listed the modules for which you are registered this semester.
    - Click the title of the module for which you wish to submit an essay.
    - Click the icon which appears in the submit column.
    - Enter a submission title, attach the file which contains your essay and click submit.

Please note that turnitinUK accepts the following formats: Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, RTF, PDF, Post-Script, plain text, and HTML)

○ Check that you have submitted the correct essay for this module and then click <yes submit>.

○ A digital receipt will now appear on screen. Directly below the title of the essay you have submitted you will see your '**paper ID' number. Write it down**. This number is unique to the particular essay you have submitted for the module. You must enter this number when you complete the cover sheet which accompanies the submission of the hard copy of your essay.

Secondly, you must **submit a hard copy of your essay**. **The hard copy submission must be an exact copy of the electronic copy**. You must not alter it in any way. Submission of non-identical copies of your essay may be deemed to constitute use of unfair means and will be dealt with accordingly.

- To submit the hard copy of your essay you should proceed as follows:
  ○ **Essays must be handed into the Politics Departmental Office.**
  ○ You must attach a completed Departmental essay receipt form to your essay. **Essays will not be accepted without a fully completed cover sheet attached.**
  ○ You must submit your essay by the deadline indicated in this module handbook. **The date/time at which you submit the hard copy of your essay will be deemed to be the formal point of submission.** Penalties for late submission will be calculated from this date/time

4.3 Submission Deadlines

The Department has a strict policy with regard to the late submission of essays and it is essential that you are familiar with this. Generally, essay submission dates are standardised across each academic year. This means that you will have several essays to submit on one day, but it does not mean that you should start work on them all at the same time! Time management is an essential study skill and it is your responsibility to ensure that all stipulated deadlines are complied with.

Essay extensions will not be given under any circumstances. Students should always endeavour to submit work on time, but if you are unable to do so you should submit the work as soon as reasonably possible, accompanied by a mitigating circumstances form (on which you must explain why your essay was late) and supporting documentary evidence (e.g. a medical certificate). What is likely to be deemed to be 'reasonable' will vary depending on the circumstances and you are **strongly advised to contact your Head of Year** regarding this matter. Please note, however, that whilst **Heads of Year** are able to advise on appropriate timeframes for submission, they **cannot give extensions**.

Mitigating circumstances must be submitted within 7 days of the essay submission date if your mitigating circumstances are to be considered by the Department. If you fail to submit your mitigating circumstances within this 7 day limit they may only be considered by the Department with the permission of the University's Student Progress Committee. A mitigating circumstances form can be obtained from the Departmental Office, via the Department's *eBridge* site, or at http://www.hull.ac.uk/policyregister/qualityhandbook/section_d/D02annex1

At the end of the semester, the DAPC will consider evidence submitted by students who have failed to comply with submission deadlines and decide whether any penalty should be applied. **In the absence of evidence demonstrating good cause, a deduction of five percentage points (marks) per day will be levied (excluding weekends and Bank holidays). The imposition of penalties begins from the deadline on the day of**

submission (12.00 noon), with the deduction of a further five percentage points for every subsequent 24 hours which pass without submission. PLEASE NOTE: Marks deducted WILL NOT be indicated on essay feedback sheets. Students will be notified in writing by the Departmental Office of any marks deducted by the DAPC. (Examples: The following assume a submission deadline of 12.00pm (noon), Monday, 1st December; late submission without good cause; and that, without penalty, the essay would receive a mark of 60%. Example 1: Essay submitted at 3.00pm on Monday 1st December. Outcome: Essay deducted 5 percentage points and receives a mark of 55%. Example 2: Essay submitted at 11.00am on Wednesday, 3rd December. Outcome: Essay deducted 10 percentage points and receives a mark of 50%. Example 3: Essay submitted at 3.00 pm on Wednesday, 3rd December. Outcome: Essay deducted 15 percentage points and receives a mark of 45%.)

Please note that **computer problems** (e.g. printing problems, corrupted or unreadable discs, incompatible software, lost or stolen hardware etc.) **will not be accepted as grounds for late submission**. The Department will assume that you have taken all reasonable steps to protect your work. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that you backup your work on a regular basis and that you use of the University shared drive. Alternatively, emailing your work to yourself will ensure that it is not lost.

Students should be aware that, under Paragraph 33(a) of the University's *Programmes Regulations - Honours Degrees,* a student who has not met the specified module requirements relating to submission of assessed work may be denied the right of re-assessment in that module. Failure to attend exams as scheduled may also adversely affect your chance of being referred in a module should you fail to pass it. Persistent failure to comply with submission deadlines may, in accordance with Paragraph 35(a), result in exclusion from assessment and/or termination of a student's programme of study.

Students with a registered disability, officially recognised by the University's Disability Service should consult the Department's Disabilities Tutor regarding the submission schedule for their essays. As appropriate, the Disabilities Tutor will authorise staggered deadlines, but these must be formally applied for and agreed. Once agreed these deadlines must be strictly adhered to. Work submitted other than in accordance with this agreed schedule will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures outlined above.

4.4 Essay Format

Essays must be word-processed. Essays will be retained to allow for double marking and (where necessary) external verification. Students wishing to have a copy of their essay returned should submit work in duplicate.

Essays <u>must</u> be correctly referenced. Students are advised to use the system of annotation laid out in the Departmental Student Handbook. Quotations MUST be indicated either by the use of quotation marks or by indentation of the quoted text; use of a footnote is not, on its own, sufficient. Please also note that references are required not only when using a direct quotation. They must also be included when summarising, paraphrasing or interpreting arguments put forward by another scholar. Annotating essays is an integral part of essay writing and is, therefore, one of the many elements taken into account in marking work. Accordingly, essays which are not correctly referenced will be penalised. Failure to correctly reference may also give rise to an allegation of plagiarism (see Section 4.5 below).

A full **bibliography**, arranged alphabetically by author surname, should also be attached to the end of essays. The bibliography must contain all sources referred to, including sources of general use but not specifically cited in the footnotes.

4.5   Plagiarism and 'self-plagiarism'

Plagiarism - passing off the work of others as your own - is a serious academic offence. It is considered to be a use of 'unfair means' and the University, Faculty and Department have clear policies to deal with it. 'Self-plagiarism' is also strictly prohibited. Self-plagiarism is the submission of a piece of work, in part or in whole, on more than one occasion and may be considered to be a form of unfair means. All allegations of plagiarism (and all other matters relating to the use of unfair means) will be referred to the Dean of Faculty and will be dealt with in accordance with University regulations under the *Code of Practice on the Use of Unfair Means* available at http://www.hull.ac.uk/policyregister/qualityhandbook/section_f/F08.doc. All students should fully apprise themselves of these documents.

4.6   Essay Length

This module handbook clearly specifies the maximum length of the essay which you must submit. **Your essay must not exceed this limit. Essays which exceed the stipulated maximum word length, even by one word, will be penalised** as set out below. There are two reasons for this: firstly, being able to produce work of a specified length is an important skill and an integral part of essay writing; secondly, ensuring that students' work does not exceed a stipulated word length makes essay based assessment more equitable.

Amount over word limit	Marks deducted
Up to 25%	10 marks
26-50%	25 marks
Over 50%	Mark of zero awarded

You must declare the word length of your essay on the cover sheet. It is your responsibility to provide a word count which is accurate and which complies fully with the regulations stated in this handbook. **The word count which you declare will be taken to be definitive.** Please note, however, that **declaring an inaccurate word count may be deemed to constitute the use of unfair means**.

Please note that the **essay title, citation footnotes/references and your bibliography must not be included as part of the declared word count. However, textual footnotes must be included in the word count.** A citation footnote is one which simply shows the source(s) you have used e.g. J. Goldstein, *International Relations* (4th Edition) (New York: Longman, 2000) A textual footnote is one which is composed of prose and which is intended to provide the reader with information additional to that contained within the main body of text.

5.   YOUR RIGHT OF APPEAL

You have the right to appeal against decisions taken regarding your academic progress, including the award of a qualification. You may not, however, appeal against academic judgement. For further information see http://www.hull.ac.uk/policyregister/qualityhandbook/section_e/E01.doc. Impartial advice on appeals is available from the Students' Union Advice Centre (details available at http://www.hullstudent.com/advice) or the Senior Tutor responsible for students within the Department of Politics and International Studies. **The Senior Tutor is currently Dr Nigel**

Young. Dr Young can be contacted by telephone on 465442 or by email at n.a.young@hull.ac.uk.

6. MARKING CRITERIA

The following criteria are for guidance only, and do not preclude the need for the application of sensible discretion by examiners. They are used in the context of nationally developing norms for the standard of a degree and consultation with external examiners.

First Class (Exceptional, 90%-100%)
An exceptional answer to the question.
- Clear, sharply focused and incisive argument displaying outstanding skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows outstanding knowledge of the topic and associated literature, a well expressed and highly sophisticated understanding, and an ability to fully integrate one's own approach within the wider literature.
- Outstanding quality of analysis and approach is maintained consistently throughout the entirety of the piece of assessed work.
- Displays originality in handling the problem, with an exceptional degree of insight and independent thought.
- Excellent literary style and presentation, including economy of expression, and very good grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing in line with current professional standards.
- Deemed to be of publishable quality.

First Class (Outstanding, 80%-89%)
An outstanding answer to the question.
- Clear, sharply focused and incisive argument displaying outstanding skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows a comprehensive knowledge of the topic and associated literature, a well expressed and highly sophisticated understanding, and an ability to integrate one's own approach within the wider literature.
- Excellent quality of analysis and approach is maintained consistently throughout the piece of assessed work.
- Displays originality in handling the problem, with an outstanding degree of insight and independent thought.
- Excellent literary style and presentation, including economy of expression, and very good grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing in line with current professional standards.
- Deemed to be of potentially publishable quality.

First Class (Clear, 70%-79%)
An excellent answer to the question.
- Clear, sharply focused and incisive argument displaying impressive skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows a very wide knowledge of the topic and associated literature, a well expressed and sophisticated understanding, and negligible errors and omissions.
- Very high quality of analysis and approach is maintained consistently throughout the majority of the piece of assessed work.
- Displays originality in handling the problem.
- Excellent literary style and presentation, including economy of expression, and good grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing up to current professional standards.

Upper Second Class (Top, 65%-69%)

A very good answer to the question.
- Clear, well-focused and logical argument displaying skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows evidence of reading in breadth and depth, sound understanding and minimal errors and omissions.
- Adopts a thoughtful, non-standard approach in handling the problem.
- Effective literary style and presentation, including adequate economy of expression, and good grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of a high standard.

Upper Second Class (Bottom, 60%-64%)
A good answer to the question.
- Clear, well-focused and logical argument displaying skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows evidence of reading in breadth and depth, with signs of sound understanding and minimal errors and omissions.
- Adopts a thoughtful and appropriate approach in handling the problem.
- Effective literary style and presentation, including adequate economy of expression, and acceptable grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of a high standard.

Lower Second Class (Top, 55%-59%)
A solid answer to the question.
- Reasonably clear, fairly well focused and generally coherent argument displaying some skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows familiarity with the main sources, with signs of a satisfactory grasp of the main points, few errors and omissions, and minimal padding.
- Adopts an acceptable but rather standard approach in handling the problem.
- Adequate literary style and presentation, including reasonable economy of expression, and generally acceptable grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of an acceptable standard.

Lower Second Class (Bottom, 50%-54%)
An adequate answer to the question.
- Somewhat vague, ill-focused and/or inconsistent argument nevertheless displaying some skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows evidence of reading of the main sources, but some of the main points poorly understood, some significant errors and omissions, and/or some padding.
- Approach in handling the problem either quite routine or compromised by uneven understanding.
- Weak literary style and/or presentation, possibly including clumsy expression, and some unacceptable errors or grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of a questionable standard.

Third Class (40%-49%)
A poor answer to the question.
- Unclear, ill-focused and/or illogical argument nevertheless displaying some skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows some evidence of reading or other learning but only limited understanding of the issues raised, with some major errors and omissions, and/or significant padding.
- Approach in handling the problem not completely unsound but superficial and flawed by limited understanding.
- Poor literary style and/or presentation, probably including clumsy expression, and many unacceptable errors of grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of a barely acceptable standard.

Compensatable Fail (35%-39%)
A minimal answer to the question.
- Unclear, unfocused and/or illogical argument displaying only minimal skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis and marshalling evidence.
- Shows some evidence of reading or other learning but poor understanding of the issues raised, with many errors and omissions, and/or significant padding.
- Approach in handling the problem largely unsound on account of carelessness or lack of essential information.
- Poor literary style and/or presentation, including clumsy expression, and many unacceptable errors of grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of an unacceptable standard.

Fail (20%-34%)
A very poor answer to the question.
- Very limited, unclear, unfocused and/or illogical argument displaying no skill in elucidating concepts, conducting analysis or marshalling evidence.
- Shows some evidence of very limited reading or other learning but poor understanding of the issues raised, with many errors and omissions, and/or significant padding.
- Approach in handling the problem largely unsound on account of carelessness or lack of essential information.
- Very poor literary style and/or presentation, including clumsy expression, and many unacceptable errors of grammar and punctuation.
- Referencing of an unacceptable standard, with an absence of any academically based sources of information.

Poor Fail (10%-19%)
A mostly irrelevant answer to the question.
- Almost total absence of argument and/or mostly irrelevant to the topic.
- Shows no evidence of reading or other learning, displays very poor understanding of the issues raised and consists mainly of errors and/or considerable padding.
- Approach in handling the problem unsound on account of carelessness or lack of essential information.
- Very poor literary style and/or presentation, including clumsy expression, and many unacceptable errors of grammar and punctuation, and/or of very short length.
- No referencing.

Extremely Poor Fail (0%-9%)
A completely irrelevant answer to the question.
- Absence of argument and/or irrelevant to the topic.
- Shows no evidence of reading or other learning, displays no understanding of the issues raised and consists mainly of errors and/or considerable padding.
- Approach in handling the problem unsound on account of carelessness or lack of essential information.
- Very poor literary style and/or presentation, including clumsy expression, and many unacceptable errors of grammar and punctuation, making it incomprehensible, and/or of very short length.
- No referencing.

7. ESSAY TITLES

1. Should Internet hate speech be protected in the UK?

2. How significant is crime-facilitating speech on the Internet and what can be done to address this challenge?

3. Is it possible to increase trust on the Internet?

4. In what ways crime and terror are connected on the Internet?

Alternatively, students may propose an essay title of their interest. In order to ensure that the title is appropriate to the module and its learning outcomes, title composition of the title should be done in consultation with the Module Coordinator and **must** be approved by the coordinator. **Essays on titles which have not been approved by the Module Coordinator will be awarded a mark of zero.**

Essay deadline: 12.00pm (noon) <u>Monday 16th May 2011.</u>

8.   SEMINAR 'TIPS'

In preparing for seminars you should note the following points:

- The reading material in this reading list is split into two basic categories. Firstly, a number of **core texts** are listed. These **should be referred to throughout the module, prior to the reading listed for each tutorial**.

- In addition to core texts, **specific texts** are listed for each tutorial topic. The literature listed here **does not constitute an exhaustive reading list**. Students should use their initiative in preparing for classes; use the library's computer system to search out material and in particular refer to the extensive range of journals available.

- When referring to books **use your common sense**. For guidance this reading list often cites specific book chapters, but many of the books referred to will have been published in a number of editions and in each edition chapters may have changed. For this reason it is important that you use the chapter references for guide purposes only.

- **Consider your fellow students**. Inevitably library resources are not infinite; we don't have a copy of every book for every student. Do not take books out of the library and have them sitting, unused, in your room while others strive to get hold of them. Photocopying requisite chapters and returning the book immediately to the shelf maximises access for others. This method also allows you to write on or highlight the photocopied text without damaging the original copy.

- **When using electronic resources you must be discerning**. Many recognised, refereed journals are now available on-line and these are an invaluable resource. At the other end of the scale is a vast array of material posted by people who know little if anything about the topic on which they have chosen to write. So it is crucial that you remember that anyone can post anything; see, for example, my guide to open-heart surgery!

- **Some of the material you are asked to read is difficult**. The language used and arguments forwarded are often complex. **Don't be afraid!** You won't understand everything that you read, but then, if it were that simple, people wouldn't be able to build careers arguing about the issues raised.

- Finally, remember that the key in preparing for tutorials is that you should be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the topic of debate. You may find it advantageous to work in groups in preparing for tutorials (though work on essays should be yours and yours alone!) as discussing matters in this way can often help clarify them. Group working also allows for the division of labour, hence maximising the amount of material you can cover, and the sharing of books etc. Whichever working practice you adopt, it is not necessarily expected that you read everything listed, but it is expected that you **read something!**

9.   SEMINARS

Readings noted with * are optional.

1. **The Importance of Freedom of Expression**
2. **Internet's History**
3. **Technological Aspects**
4. **Responsibility on the Internet**
5. **Hate, Racism and Holocaust denial on the Internet**
6. **Crime-Facilitating Speech on the Internet**
7. **True Threats on the Internet**
8. **Incitement on the Internet**
9. **Terrorism on the Internet**
10. **Child Pornography and Sexual Abuse on the Internet**
11. **Conclusion and Revision Class**

1. **The Importance of Freedom of Expression**

Why freedom of expression is important?
What does it mean to be tolerant?
What are overriding principles? Should they be moral?
What are the boundaries of free expression?
What are the latent and the manifest kinds of tolerance?
Critic of the articles.

Aharon Barak, "Freedom of Expression and Its Limitations", in Raphael Cohen-Almagor (ed.), *Challenges to Democracy: Essays in Honour and Memory of Isaiah Berlin* (London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2000), pp. 167-188.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "The Scope of Tolerance and Its Moral Reasoning", in *The Scope of Tolerance* (London and NY: Routledge, 2006), chap. 1.

Alexander Meiklejohn, "Freedom of Speech", in Peter Radcliff (ed.), *Limits of Liberty* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 19-26.

Alexander Meiklejohn, "American Individualism and the Constitution", in *Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People* (N.Y.: Harper, 1965), pp. 51-77.

* John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP., 1999), pp. 216-221.

* Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *The Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1994), chap. 5.

* Wayne Sumner, "Should Hate Speech Be Free Speech? John Stuart Mill and the Limits of Tolerance", in R. Cohen-Almagor (ed.), *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).

* Lee C. Bollinger, *The Tolerant Society* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986), pp. 175-200.

2. **Internet's History**

What drove the ARPA scientists?
What are the principles of the Internet?
What was the impact of commercialization?
Which founding principles remain true today?
Critic of the articles.

Charles Dubow, "The Internet: An Overview," in Cindy Mur (ed.), *Does the Internet Benefit Society?* (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven, 2005).

Leonard Kleinrock, "History of the Internet and Its Flexible Future", *IEEE Wireless Communications* (February 2008): 8-18.

James Slevin, *The Internet and Society* (Oxford: Polity, 2000), chaps. 1.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
KDL Main	303.4834 SLE	NORMAL LOAN	

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Internet History", *International Journal of Technoethics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (April-June 2011), pp. 46-65.

Barry M. Leiner, Vinton G. Cerf, David D. Clark *et al.*, "A Brief History of the Internet," *The Internet Society*, http://www.isoc.org/internet/history/brief.shtml

Richard T. Griffiths, *History of the Internet* (2002), chap. 2, at http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/history/ivh/chap2.htm

* Gary P. Schneider and Jessica Evans, *New Perspectives on the Internet: Introductory* (Boston: Thomson Course Technology, 2007), chap. 3.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 7th Floor	TK 5105.875 I57 S3		

* Gary Chapman, "Shaping Technology for the 'Good Life'", in Douglas Schuler and Peter Day, *Shaping the Network Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004), chapter 3.

* Robert J. Cavalier (ed.), *The Impact of the Internet on Our Moral Lives* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), chapter 5.

3. Technological Aspects

What is packet switching?
What are the most common modes of communication on the Internet? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
What is file sharing?
What are crawlers?
Is it possible to monitor today?
What filters exist today?
What technological innovations are still in need?
Critic of the articles.

David Beckett, "Internet Technology," in Duncan Langford (ed.), *Internet Ethics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 7th Floor	TK 5105.875 I57 L2	NORMAL LOAN	AVAILABLE
BJL 7th Floor	TK 5105.875 I57 L2	NORMAL LOAN	DUE 04-01-11
KDL Main	174.90904 LAN	NORMAL LOAN	AVAILABLE
KDL Main	174.90904 LAN		

Preston Gralla, *How the Internet Works* (Indianapolis, IN: Que Publishing, 2007), chap. 5.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
KDL Main	004.678 GRA		

Lauri S. Friedman (ed.), *The Internet* (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven, 2008), chap. 2.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL Education Resources	HM 851 I6		

Katie Hafner and Matthew Lyon, *Where Wizards Stay Up Late* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996), chap. 5.

* Duncan Langford, *Internet Ethics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), chap. 4.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 7th Floor	TK 5105.875 I57 L2	NORMAL LOAN	AVAILABLE
BJL 7th Floor	TK 5105.875 I57 L2	NORMAL LOAN	DUE 04-01-11
KDL Main	174.90904 LAN		

* Ithiel de Sola Pool, *Technologies of Freedom* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), Conclusion.

4. Responsibility on the Internet

The challenges posed by the Internet
Is there trust on the Internet?
What are the responsibilities of Netusers and ISPs?
Responsibility of Net readers
Is it possible to enforce Net responsibility?
Critic of the articles.

"Moral Responsibility," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* **(2004), at http://plato.stanford.edu/**

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Responsibility of and Trust in ISPs", *Knowledge, Technology and Policy***, Vol. 23, Issue 3 (2010), pp. 381-396.**

Michael R. Nelson, "A Response to Cohen-Almagor", *Knowledge, Technology and Policy,* **Vol. 23, Issue 3 (2010).**

Dorothy E. Denning, "Comments on Responsibility of and Trust in ISPs", *Knowledge, Technology and Policy,* **Vol. 23, Issue 3 (2010).**

* Marc Le Menestrel, Mark Hunter and Henri-Claude de Bettignies, "Internet e-ethics in Confrontation with an Activists' Agenda: Yahoo! on Trial," *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 39 (August 2002): 135-144.

* M.R. McGuire, *Technology, Crime and Justice* (NY; Routledge, 2012): 57-83.

* Robert Corn-Revere, "Caught in the Seamless Web: Does the Internet's Global Reach Justify Less Freedom of Speech?," in Adam Thierer and Clyde Wayne Crews Jr. (eds.), *Who Rules the Net?* (Washington DC.: Cato Institute, 2003).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
KDL Main	343.09944 THI		

* Douglas W. Vick, "Regulating Hatred," in Mathias Klang and Andrew Murray (eds.), *Human Rights in the Digital Age* (London: GlassHouse, 2005).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 3rd Floor	JC 599 G7 H9		

* Stewart Lewis, "Reputation and Corporate Responsibility," *Journal of Communication Management,* Vol. 7, No. 4 (2003): 356-394.

* R. Cohen-Almagor, "Responsibility of Net Users", in Mark Fackler and Robert S. Fortner (eds.), *The Handbook of Global Communication and Media Ethics*, Vol. I (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), pp. 415-433.

* James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility* (London: Routledge, 2009).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 5118 C9		

5. Hate, Racism and Holocaust denial on the Internet

Should ISPs abide by local laws?
What are the main lessons to draw from the Yahoo! Saga?
What is Net neutrality?
What is Content Net Neutrality?
Critic of the articles.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Freedom of Expression, Internet Responsibility and Business Ethics: The Yahoo! Saga and Its Aftermath", *Journal of Business Ethics* (2011), http://www.springerlink.com/content/gk777707jp2485r5/fulltext.pdf

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Holocaust Denial Is A Form of Hate Speech", *Amsterdam Law Forum*, Vol. 2, No 1 (2009), pp. 33-42.

Stephen L. Newman, "Should Hate Speech Be allowed on the Internet? A Reply to Raphael Cohen-Almagor", *Amsterdam Law Forum*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2010), pp. 119-123

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Countering Hate on the Internet – A Rejoinder", *Amsterdam Law Forum*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2010), pp. 125-132.

* Jack Goldsmith and Tim Wu, *Who Controls the Internet? Illusions of a Borderless World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), chap. 3.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
KDL Main	303.4833 GOL		

* Joel R. Reidenberg, "Yahoo and Democracy on the Internet", *Jurimetrics*, Vol. 42 (2002), pp. 261-280.

* Joel R. Reidenberg, "Technology and Internet Jurisdiction," *Univ. of Penn. L. Rev.*, Vol. 153 (2005): 1951-1974.

* R. Cohen-Almagor, "Content Net Neutrality – A Critic", in Hilmi Demir (ed.), *Luciano Floridi`s Philosophy of Technology: Critical Reflections* (Springer, 2011).

6. Crime-Facilitating Speech on the Internet

Linkbase, in the name of freedom of speech
The problem of cyberstalking
How crime is organized on the Net?
What is crime-facilitating speech?
Critic of the articles.

http://www.linkbase.org/articles/

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

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL Education Resources	HM 851 F9		

Herman T. Tavani and Frances S. Grodzinsky, "Cyberstalking, Personal Privacy, and Moral Responsibility", *Ethics and Information Technology***, Vol. 4 (2002): 123–132.**

Peter Grabosky, "The Internet, Technology, and Organized Crime", *Asian Criminology***, Vol. 2 (2007):145–161.**

* Terrence Berg, "The Internet Facilitates Crime," in Cindy Mur (ed.), *Does the Internet Benefit Society?* (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven, 2005).

* Eugene Volokh, "Crime Facilitating Speech", *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 57 (2005).

7. True Threats on the Internet

What is the difference between advocacy and incitement?;
What are true threats?
Why Baker was not convicted? Was the court ruling justified?
Should we shut down some websites?
Critic of the court cases.

USA v. Baker and Gonda **890 F. Supp. 1375, US District Court, E.D. Michigan (June 21, 1995).**

USA v. Alkhabaz **104 F.3d 1492 (6th Cir. 1997).**

The Secretary, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, on behalf of Bonnie Jouhari and Pilar Horton v. Ryan Wilson and ALPHA HQ, **before Alan W. Heifetz, Chief Administrative Law Judge (decided July 19, 2000), available at http://www.hud.gov/utilities/intercept.cfm?/offices/oalj/cases/fha/pdf/wilson.pdf**

United States v. Machado **195 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 1999).**

8. Incitement on the Internet

What lessons do we learn from the Nuremberg files?;
Lessons from the Paladin case;
Should we place limits on publication of books?;

Does the mode of communication make a difference?;
Critic of the court cases.

***Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists,* U.S Court of Appeals for the Nine Circuit (May 21, 2002).**

***Rice v. Paladin Enterprises Inc.,* No. 96-2412, 128 F.3d 233 (November 10, 1997).**

Video: "Deliberate Intent," Paladin Press.

* Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists, No. 95-1671-JO, 41 F.Supp.2d 1130 (March 16, 1999).

* Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists, U.S Court of Appeals for the Nine Circuit (March 28, 2001).

* Jennifer E. Rothman, "Freedom of Speech and True Threats", *Harvard J. of Law & Public Policy*, Vol. 25, Issue 1 (2001).

9. **Terrorism on the Internet**

How do terrorists use the Net?
What can be done to counter their activities?
Who should be responsible for the terrorist presence on the Net?
How can we protect against government abuse of powers?
What is encryption?
Critic of the articles.

Dorothy E. Denning, "Terror's Web: How the Internet Is Transforming Terrorism", in Yvonne Jewkes and Majid Yar (eds.), *Handbook of Internet Crime* (Portland, OR: Willan, 2010): 194-213.

Maura Conway, "Terrorist Use of the Internet and Fighting Back", *Information and Security,* Vol.19 (2006): 9-30.

John B. Morris, "Free Speech and Online Intermediaries in an Age of Terror Recruitment", Statement before the House Committee on Homeland Security (Washington, May 26, 2010).

Anthony D. Romero, "Internet Terror Recruitment and Tradecraft: How Can We Address an Evolving Tool While Protecting Free Speech?", Statement before the House Committee on Homeland Security (Washington, May 26, 2010).

Bruce Hoffman, "Internet Terror Recruitment and Tradecraft: How Can We Address an Evolving Tool While Protecting Free Speech?", Statement before the House Committee on Homeland Security (Washington, May 26, 2010).

Brian Michael Jenkins, "No Path to Glory: Deterring Homegrown Terrorism", Statement before the House Committee on Homeland Security (Washington, May 26, 2010).

  * Hanna Rogan, *JIHADISM ONLINE - A study of how al-Qaida and radical Islamist groups use the Internet for terrorist purposes* (Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, 2006).

* Martin C. Golumbic, *Fighting Terror Online* (NY: Springer, 2008), chap. 4.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 3rd Floor	HV 6431 G6		

* Yariv Tsfati and Gabriel Weimann, "www.terrorism.com: Terror on the Internet", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 25 (2002), pp. 317-332.

* Marc Sageman, *Leaderless Jihad: Terror Networks in the Twenty-First Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 3rd Floor	HV 6431 S1		

  * Henry A. Giroux, *Beyond the Spectacle of Terrorism* (Boulder, CO.: Paradigm Publishers, March 2006).

10. Child Pornography and Sexual Abuse on the Internet

How do sex offenders utilize the Internet?
What can be done to counter their activities?
Critic of the articles.

M. Eneman, "The new face of child pornography", in M. Klang and A. Murray (Eds.), *Human Rights in the Digital Age* (London: GlassHouse, 2005).

M.A. Healy, "Child pornography: an international perspective"*, Computer Crime Research Center* (2 August 2004), http://www.crime-research.org/articles/536/

P. Jenkins, "Written testimony before the subcommittee on oversight and investigations", House Committee on Energy and Commerce (26 September 2006).

* E. Quayle and M. Taylor, "Child pornography and the Internet: perpetuating a cycle of abuse", *Deviant Behaviour*, *23*(4) (2002), pp. 331-362.

* K. W. Saunders, *Saving Our Children from the First Amendment* (New York: New York University Press, 2003).

* J. Stanley, "The Internet can be dangerous for children", in C. Mur (Ed.), *Does the Internet Benefit Society?* (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven, 2005).

* M.C. Seto, R.K. Hanson, and K. M. Babchishin, 'Contact sexual offending by men with online sexual offenses', *Sexual Abuse*, *23* (1) (March 2011), pp. 124-145.

* J. Wolak, *Child Sexual Exploitation on the Internet* (Oxford: WileyBlackwell, 2010).

* J. Wolak, D. Finkelhor, K.J. Mitchell and M.L. Ybarra, "Online "predators" and their victims: myths, realities and implications for prevention and treatment", *American Psychologist, 63* (2008)*,* pp. 111-128.

* J. Wolak, D. Finkelhor, and K. Mitchell, "Child pornography possessors: trends in offender and case characteristics", *Sexual Abuse*, *23*(1) (2011), pp. 22-42.

11. Conclusion and Revision Class

Looking ahead
Privacy on the Internet
Critic of the articles.

Jonathan Zittrain, *The Future of the Internet – And How to Stop It* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), chap. 9; Conclusion.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
KDL Main	303.4834 ZIT		

Jeffrey Rosen, "The Web Means the End of Forgetting", *New York Times* (July 19, 2010).

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, "In Internet's Way", in Mark Fackler and Robert S. Fortner (eds.), *Ethics and Evil in the Public Sphere: Media, Universal Values & Global Development* (Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

* R. Cohen-Almagor, "Conclusions", in *The Scope of Tolerance* (London: Routledge, 2005) (only the part on the Internet).

10.   MODULE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

At the end of each module students have the opportunity to fill in a Module Evaluation Questionnaire, through which they feedback on the respective module. This provides staff with valuable information to consider when reviewing their modules. Below you will find a summary of the feedback received for this module last year, accompanied by the module coordinator's response.

BOX FROM EACH MEQ REPORT TO GO HERE.