

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Opportunity.....	4
i. Information superhighway.....	4
Risk.....	5
i. Grooming.....	6
ii. Exposure to pornography / sexualized content.....	7
Girls Online.....	9
i. Cyberbullying and Sexual harassment.....	9
ii. Media sexualisation of women and girls.....	11
Other Themes.....	12
i. Gaming.....	12
ii. Exposure to suicide instructions.....	13
iii. Propaganda and Empowerment.....	14
Conclusion.....	15

Introduction

“Opportunities and risk online go hand in hand...[e]fforts to increase opportunities may also increase risks, while efforts to reduce risks may restrict children’s opportunities.”¹

- EU Kids Online

Between 2007 and 2012, the European Union (EU) examined a broad range of topics relating to children and young persons, and their engagement with digital technologies. The European parliamentary discussions and EU policy documents of the last five years have tended to characterize the relationship between young people and digital technology in two ways—as opportunity, and as risk. As the European digital economy continues to expand, young people in Europe are seen as the key to the continuation of that growth—a largely untapped market of online consumers whose needs and interests must be considered.

Although young people, having grown up in an online world, are often portrayed as experts in digital technology, policymakers also expressed concern that this expertise has been exaggerated, and that European children are in fact lagging behind. There is therefore a desire to properly educate young people in the use of digital technologies. At the same time, there is recognition of dangers specifically faced by children online. These dangers include online luring of young people by sexual predators (called grooming) and exposure to potentially harmful online content such as pornography. Cyberbullying and sexual harassment are also risks that have been identified. In the last two years, these two risks have come to be more closely associated with girls. Other risks discussed include exposure to violence, lost humanity (lack of empathy), juvenile delinquency, and deteriorating mental and physical health associated with online gaming. There are also concerns that young people are coming into contact with other harmful content, such as suicide instructions and terrorist propaganda. Conversely, content that promotes European ideals of freedom and democracy are recognized and celebrated. The discourse in the EU regarding children and digital technology has focused primarily on maintaining a balance between opportunity and risk.

¹ Sonia Livingston et al, *EU Kids Online: Final Report* (London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 2011) [*EU Kids Online*] at 2.

August 2013 – J. Williams

Opportunity

“I am glad that one of the specific measures to bring about development through knowledge mentioned by Mr. Barroso was the provision of an Internet connection for every school. This is very important because it ensures equality of opportunity for all children and young people.”²

- Member of European Parliament (MEP) Ewa Tomaszewska

i. Information superhighway

Given the history of the EU as a body established to promote the better integration of Europe’s economy, it is not surprising that much of the discourse surrounding children, the internet, and the use of the technology generally, has focused on the need to prepare European citizens for the new digital economy. On one hand, children are characterized as tech-savvy with “superior technological skill”³ and greater computer literacy than their parents and teachers.⁴ At other times, children are viewed as lagging behind. In a recent EU policy document, *Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* (“Strategy”),⁵ the European Commission (“the Commission”) contested the view that European children are tech savvy digital natives.⁶ The Commission’s Strategy suggests that there is actually a serious digital skills deficit on the horizon in Europe, and that European children must be better trained and equipped to conquer the digital divide. The concern first and foremost is economic growth, and the Internet is seen as the pathway to successful growth. For example, the Commission contends that “[c]hildren... form a specific

² EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 26 March 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

³ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 20 November 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Maria Yannakoudaki).

⁴ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 25 March 2009, [2009] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Urszula Gacek). Also see, EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 22 October 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Zita Plestinska); and EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 19 February 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (Member of the Commission, Viviane Reding).

⁵ EC, Commission, *Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children* (Brussels: EC, 2012).

⁶ *Ibid* at 5.

August 2013 – J. Williams

group requiring attention...digital skills and media literacy for children will help improve their job perspectives and employability and help them become confident digital citizens.”⁷

In addition to being viewed as the future of Europe’s digital economy, children and young adults are seen as the leading consumers of the Internet and, consequently, a lucrative marketplace for businesses. According to the Commission, “better and wider use of the Internet by children is opening the door for intensive business development” and “the demands of children opens up a range of business opportunities.”⁸ These business opportunities are seen to extend to children themselves who have the potential to “become online creators and start up businesses.”⁹

While the Commission is steadfast in its objective of creating competent digital citizens, the risks posed to children on the Internet are also acknowledged and seriously considered. The Commission Strategy echoes many of the concerns raised by Members of European Parliament (MEPs) over the last five years (see *Risk*, below). At the forefront is the need to protect children against sexual abuse and exploitation.¹⁰ In order to balance the opportunity children present with the risks involved, the Commission proposed promoting a new “eco-system” for children online that is both safe and enriching. In order to achieve this, the Commission suggests focussing on education, self-empowerment,¹¹ and industry self-regulation.¹²

Risk

“It is an unfortunate reality that the wonderful opportunities the Internet presents to us all have, in direct proportion, increased the moral, physical and social danger to our children and young people throughout the world...”¹³

- MEP Jim Allister

⁷ *Ibid* at 15.

⁸ *Ibid* at 2.

⁹ *Ibid* at 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid* at 13.

¹¹ *Ibid* at 8.

¹² *Ibid* at 9-10.

¹³ EC, Sitting of Monday, 20 October 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

August 2013 – J. Williams

Between 2007 and 2012, there was considerable awareness raising among MEPs, with respect to the risks faced by children in the online world. At times, the dangers were imprecisely defined but framed as significant. MEP Mieczyslaw Janowski commented that “[t]he Internet may be likened to a knife that is useful for cutting bread, but it may also be used to inflict grievous psychological harm on children through evil content.”¹⁴ MEP Stavros Lambrindis suggested that “the internet is the new village square. Just as parents warn their children not to talk to strangers in the village square, so they should be educated and made aware that similar concern and advice are needed when it comes to the Internet.”¹⁵ Sometimes risks were identified more explicitly. The main risks discussed by MEPs since 2007 were child sexual exploitation in the form of luring (called grooming), exposure to pornography / sexualized content, and cyberbullying (for cyberbullying, see *Girls Online* below).

i. Grooming

Many MEPs have commented on child sexual exploitation online, particularly in conjunction with the threat of online grooming. Grooming in these debates refers to the online solicitation of children for purposes of sexual exploitation. In 2010, MEP Tiziano Motti commented,

Today paedophiles are not old men who trick children in parks but people who circulate within an internationally organised structure and who use the most modern forms of technology, such as the Internet. Therefore, today, young people, boys and girls, are not even safe within their own homes anymore.¹⁶

MEP Roberta Angelilli proposed that, in addition to educating parents and teachers about the danger of online grooming, EU member states should update their legislation to include grooming as an offence.¹⁷ Angelilli’s proposal was widely supported. MEP Carlo Fidanza noted,

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 15 January 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

¹⁶ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 5 May 2010, [2010] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

¹⁷ EC, *Report on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography* (Brussels: EC, 2012) [*Angelilli’s Report*]; initially suggested in EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 25 March 2009, [2009] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

August 2013 – J. Williams

By implementing thoroughgoing legislation, we can set up a robust system to prevent these crimes, including particularly close attention to the Internet, which is often used by unsupervised children of an increasingly young age and represents a dangerous way to exploit and groom children through social networks and unmonitored websites.¹⁸

Although some MEPs have emphasized criminalization and “aftercare” in the form of support for victims of sexual exploitation,¹⁹ others have pointed to need to focus on prevention policies such as educating children about the risks they encounter online and creating an online environment more suited to children’s needs.²⁰

ii. Exposure to pornography / sexualized content

Similar to the discourse on grooming, concerns have been raised about children having access to pornographic, sexual, and violent content. This was one of the primary concerns raised in MEP Silvia Costa’s *Report on protecting children in a digital world*. (“Costa’s Report”)²¹ In it, children are characterized as tech savvy but requiring protection. It states that “minors generally demonstrate great ease in using the Internet”; however, “they need help in order to use it wisely, responsibly and safely.”²² Costa’s Report also points out that children may be the victims, as well as the instigators, of crimes online, and warns that “children need to understand that their own use of digital technology may impinge on the rights of others or even constitute criminal behaviour.”²³

Costa’s Report was generally well received by MEPs. MEP Marine Yannakoudaki, referring to it, stated that “children with their natural curiosity and superior technical skills are stumbling

¹⁸ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 27 October 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

¹⁹ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 26 October 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Emine Bozkurt).

²⁰ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 26 October 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Michele Striffler).

²¹ EC, Committee on Culture and Education, *Report on protecting children in the digital world* (2012/2068 (INI)).

²² *Ibid* at 5.

²³ *Ibid* at 8.

August 2013 – J. Williams

across or seeking out pornographic material on the internet. Violent and degrading material is easily available and this is having disturbing consequences on our children.”²⁴ Also commenting on Costa’s Report, MEP Oreste Rossi suggested it was “imperative to protect minors from websites with harmful content with strong elements of violence, racism and discrimination.”²⁵ Indicative of the tension between increasing opportunity and quelling risk, some MEPs objected to the suggested measures to reduce risk. In a minority opinion, four MEPs argued that the “[m]easures...demonstrate an unwarranted bias towards the perceived dangers of the Internet, limiting the opportunities for education and innovation. Rather, we prefer to strengthen the youth’s resilience and independence.”²⁶

The discussion regarding children’s exposure to objectionable online content has also led to comments and concerns pertaining to censorship. MEP Roberta Angelilli, referring to the recommendations in her *Report on abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography*,²⁷ clarified that “obviously this is not a matter of censoring freedom of expression and freedom of opinion: only content that objectively contains images of violence and exploitation will be removed.”²⁸ Concerns over censorship had been raised in previous European Parliamentary debates dealing with the regulation of online content. MEPs Carl Land and Fernand Le Rachinel had noted that “Internet filtering for the sake of combating pornography, child pornography and terrorism is crucial, but such vigilance must be strictly defined and controlled.”²⁹ Likewise, MEP Glyn Ford, commenting on the *Report on the protection of consumers, in particular minors, in respect of the use of video games*,³⁰ suggested “[t]he danger

²⁴ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 20 November 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

²⁵ EC, Sitting of Monday, 19 November 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

²⁶ EC, Committee on Culture and Education, *Report on protecting children in the digital world* (2012/2068 (INI)) at 17.

²⁷ *Angelilli’s Report*, supra note 17.

²⁸ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 26 October 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

²⁹ EC, Sitting on Tuesday, 19 January 2010, [2010] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

³⁰ EC, Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, *Report on the protection of consumers, in particular minors, in respect of the use of video games* (2008/2173(INI)).

August 2013 – J. Williams

is that a justifiable concern in some cases turns into a ‘moral panic’ that is wilfully disproportionate to the extent of the problem.”³¹

Girls Online

*“Without her knowledge or consent [Karolina’s] boyfriend recorded their shared private experiences and posted the recordings on the Internet after the end of their relationship...I appeal to the Commission and to the Member States to combat such behaviour, which could be described as rape over the Internet.”*³²

– MEP Urszula Gacek

Discourse specifically about girls and emerging digital technology also touches on both themes of opportunity and risk. In early 2007, a European Parliamentary debate tackled the issue of discrimination against young women and girls in the field of education. Jan Fiegl, a Member of the Commission, specifically referred to “e-Inclusion” and fact that women can derive benefit from new digital technology. It was acknowledged that gender issues must be taken into account in the technology debate and that gender discrimination must be opposed.³³ Perhaps not surprisingly, the majority of the focus with respect to girls online has been on risk rather than opportunity. It was stressed by more that one MEP, during a debate on protecting children using the Internet and other communication technologies, that “consideration must always be given to the peculiarities of each gender...and the special protection which each gender needs.”³⁴

i. Cyberbullying and Sexual harassment

From 2007 to 2010, cyberbullying is repeatedly referenced as a phenomenon that affects all children in the digital world. Beginning in 2011, there seemed to be at least an implicit acknowledgement that girls may be disproportionately affected by cyberbullying. In *Cyber-Bullying and online Grooming: helping to protect against the risks*, the European Network and Information Security Agency produced a report that assessed the risk factors in an imagined

³¹ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 12 March 2009, [2009] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

³² EC, Sitting of Monday, 18 February 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

³³ EC, Sitting Wednesday, 31 January 2007, [2007] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

³⁴ EC, Sitting of Monday, 20 October 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>. (MEP Marie Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality).

August 2013 – J. Williams

online scenario.³⁵ It is notable that the imagined scenario is that of a girl / young woman navigating dangers online. At the same time, researchers Sonia Livingston, Leslie Haddon, Anke Gorzig, and Kjartan Olafsson published their report on *EU Kids Online*.³⁶ They noted that “[g]irls are more upset than boys” by online bullying³⁷ and “are also more likely to adopt proactive strategies to online harm.”³⁸

In 2012, there was European Parliamentary debate on the Report by Regina Bastos³⁹ on the Daphne programme.⁴⁰ Online bullying was explicitly mentioned in regard to expanding the Daphne programme (which is aimed at eliminating violence and discrimination against women) to include violence against women perpetrated online. For example, MEP Zigmantas Balcytis stated:

I welcome the calls for Member States to gather data on violence against women...and for the Commission to channel more funding into projects aimed at alerting the public, particularly groups at risk, to new forms of violence linked to the growing use of online social networks.⁴¹

Also in 2012, there were specific references made to girls who had been the victims of cyberbullying in Europe and abroad. In one debate, MEP Axel Voss raised the case of Canadian Amanda Todd to demonstrate that there are “some forms of behaviour on the internet which are harmful to other people. In this particular instance, it was cyber bullying.”⁴² Likewise, reference

³⁵ European Network and Information Security Agency, *Cyber-Bullying and online Grooming: helping to protect against the risks* (October 2011) online: <<http://www.enisa.europa.eu/media/>>.

³⁶ *EU Kids Online*, *supra* note 1.

³⁷ *Ibid* at 25.

³⁸ *Ibid* at 33.

³⁹ EC, Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality *Report on the Daphne programme: achievements and future prospects* (2011/2273(INI)).

⁴⁰ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 2 February 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁴¹ *Ibid*.

⁴² EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 23 October 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

August 2013 – J. Williams

was made on two separate occasions to the case of two 13-year-old Irish girls who hanged themselves after being bullied online.⁴³

ii. Media sexualisation of women and girls

Closely connected with references to online risks, as they pertain to girls and young women, are references to media sexualisation of women and girls. In 2009, during a European Parliamentary debate on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, Italian MEP Luch Ramagnoi remarked:

Forms of online grooming of children have certainly increased, but I would like to take this opportunity to denounce the exploitation of images of women also. In the majority of EU countries, an often disgusting view of womanhood is propagated, where the commercial aim is pursued not only with vulgarity but with a real contempt for women's dignity...⁴⁴

In 2012, Rapporteur Joanna Katarzyna Skzydewska produced a *Draft Report on the sexualisation of girls* (“Draft Report on Sexualization”) for the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality.⁴⁵ It examined the impact that the sexualisation of girls has on equality. The Internet is viewed as the disseminator of the “sexualisation effect.” The *Report* notes that:

In recent years incidents of sexual violence and sexual harassment have become commonplace. When such incidents are recorded using a mobile telephone, they can become a means of exerting control...contributing...in extreme cases...to the victim's suicide.⁴⁶

According to the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality *Meeting Minutes of October 10th, 2012*, the Committee did not adopt Skzydewska's Draft Report on Sexualization.⁴⁷ It is unclear exactly why it was not adopted. The Committee on Women's Rights and Gender

⁴³ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 20 November 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Jim Higgins); and EC, Sitting of Monday, 19 November 2012, [2012] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Pat the Cope Gallagher).

⁴⁴ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 3 February 2009, [2009] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁴⁵ EC, Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, *Draft Report on the sexualisation of girls* (2012/2047 (INI)).

⁴⁶ *Ibid* at 9.

⁴⁷ EC, Committee on Women Rights and Gender Equality, Minutes: Meeting of 10 October 2012 (FEMM_PV (2012)1010) at 2.

August 2013 – J. Williams

Equality did adopt a similar report, *on how marketing and advertising affect equality between women and men*,⁴⁸ which received sharp criticism from several MEPs. The proposals were equated with gender thought policing⁴⁹ and gross censorship.⁵⁰

Other Themes

*“Killer games which train young people to kill through simulation, whether played on a mobile or acted out, blunt their sense of empathy. I would have wanted the Commission to do more in this area.”*⁵¹

– MEP Hiltrud Breyer

i. Gaming

There were several dangers associated with online gaming that were presented as risks for children online. One such danger was exposure to violence, which was linked to lost humanity (lack of empathy) and delinquency. In a 2007 European Parliamentary debate on combating violence, MEP Lydia Schenardi commented,

The fight against violence...hinges on the way in which we treat the promoters of such violence. I am thinking of the Internet, where perverts and psychopaths can give free rein to their obsessions; I am thinking of video games, where sex and violence are legion...The fight against violence begins at the stage of educating our children and of building the future that we want to offer them.⁵²

Similar concerns were raised in a subsequent debate on juvenile delinquency. MEP Katerine Batzeli, who was rapporteur on the *Report on juvenile delinquency, the role of women, the family and society*⁵³ noted,

⁴⁸ EC, Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, *Report on how marketing and advertising affect equality between women and men* ((2008/2038(INI)).

⁴⁹ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 3 September 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Christopher Heaton-Harris).

⁵⁰ *Ibid* (MEP Philip Claeys).

⁵¹ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 20 June 2007, [2007] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵² EC, Sitting of Monday, 21 May 2007, [2007] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵³ EC, Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, *Report on juvenile delinquency, the role of women, the family and society* (2007/2011(INI)).

August 2013 – J. Williams

It is extremely difficult to identify the exact reasons for delinquent behaviour in a juvenile...in this day and age, there are also external factors in their lives, such as the media, technology and especially the Internet.⁵⁴

Reacting to MEP Batzeli's report, MEP Miroslav Mikolasik appealed to all stakeholders "to speak up and restrict the constant display of excessive violence, pornographic scenes, and scenes showing drug consumption in the mass media. Such images also appear on Internet sites or in generally available video games."⁵⁵

Online gaming has also been characterized as presenting obstacles to children's mental and physical health. According to MEP Boguslaw Sonik, "[u]nregulated use of the Internet and computer games, addiction and related conditions are becoming increasingly serious problems for our society and civilisation. Children and young people are the worst affected."⁵⁶ A month earlier, in a European Parliamentary debate on obesity-related health issues, MEP Anna Zaborska stated that "[t]he best way of preventing childhood obesity is not to use the television, video games and the Internet as babysitting services. Without creative activities, children and adults do not get enough exercise."⁵⁷

ii. Exposure to suicide instructions

Some concerns have been raised by MEPs about children gaining access to suicide instructions online. In 2008, during Council Question Time, Jim Allister raised the issue directly:

President-in-Office, could I direct you to another matter in terms of the protection of children in the context of media, in particular against the background of rising and alarming suicide rates in Europe, not least in my own constituency? This is, what can the Council do in respect of the gross misuse, in particular via Internet services, of readily available advice on how to commit suicide?⁵⁸

⁵⁴ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 20 June 2007, [2007] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵⁵ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 21 June 2007, [2007] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵⁶ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 9 October 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵⁷ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 24 September 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁵⁸ EC, Sitting of Wednesday, 20 February 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>; and EC, Sitting of Monday, 20 October 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>> (MEP Jim Allister).

August 2013 – J. Williams

The issue came up again during Commission Question Time in 2009. This time, MEP Jorg Leichtfried addressed the Commission:

The dangers represented by the Internet are constantly changing and we have seen the Internet move from version 1.0 to version 2.0, so to speak. In essence, this means that everything has become much more interactive. There have been cases where young people have been driven to commit suicide by web platforms and web communities of this kind.⁵⁹

iii. Propaganda and Empowerment

The Internet has been characterized by European Parliamentarians as a vehicle for young people to change themselves and the world: for better or for worse. There have been concerns raised about youth being exposed to crime in the form of terrorist propaganda and suggestions that young people are the weak link in the chain of cyber security. In 2010, MEP Carlos Coelho, in a debate on strengthening security and fundamental freedoms on the Internet, identified “5000 terrorist propaganda sites, which form a means of radicalisation and recruitment, as well as serving as a source of information on terrorist methods and resources.”⁶⁰ These remarks echoed similar sentiments expressed in 2008 in a debate on combating terrorism and protecting personal data. MEP Genowefa Grabowska stated at that time,

I would like to appeal for efficient and harmonised actions that offer everyone protection against terrorist propaganda and agitation, especially our children and young people. These individuals, who are most susceptible because they are young, open and trusting, must be protected from the dangerous texts that are being spread via the Internet and other media, often specifically under the banner of freedom of speech.⁶¹

Although MEPs have expressed fears about certain ideas young people may come in contact with on the Internet (i.e. terrorism), social media has also been characterized as a platform for the propagation of ideas of freedom and as an instrument of positive political change. This effect was most apparent during the events of the Arab Spring in 2011. In February 2011, MEP Marietje Schaake addressed parliament with the following:

⁵⁹ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 3 February 2009, [2009] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁶⁰ EC, Sitting on Tuesday, 19 January 2010, [2010] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁶¹ EC, Sitting of Tuesday, 23 September 2008, [2008] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

August 2013 – J. Williams

Mr President, I look with great admiration at the courage of citizens who defy the repression and violence of their governments. We have seen this happening in popular uprisings in Tunisia, Egypt, Iran, Algeria, Bahrain and also in Yemen. The young generation wants hope to replace cynicism, opportunities to replace poverty, justice to replace impunity and internet freedom to replace repression and censorship.⁶²

MEP Schaake followed up on these comments in May 2011, stating that “today, an open Internet is that decisive element for moving into the world of freedom. We need an Internet freedom strategy to facilitate free expression, press freedom, access to information and access to cultural and educational content.”⁶³

Conclusion

“When we view Internet sites today, we regrettably have to acknowledge that there is a lot of the sort of material that is of no good to society or human development. I am particularly concerned about children and young people, who are our most valuable asset – our future’s most valuable asset.”

MEP Hannu Takkula

Discourse surrounding children and digital technology in the EU is predominantly focused on increasing opportunities and mitigating risks. The success of Europe’s digital economy, and the ability of European children to make the most of their future within that economy, is seen to rest on successfully raising a digitally skilled workforce. What is at risk is children’s mental, physical, and emotional well being when faced with dangers online such as grooming, exposure to pornography, cyberbullying, sexual harassment, gaming, and criminal propaganda. While there are signs that a gender-based analysis of these issues is starting to emerge, they remain nascent. It remains to be seen whether these issues attract further gender-based analysis and whether the long-term goal of balancing opportunity and risk is ultimately realized.

⁶² EC, Sitting of Thursday, 17 February 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.

⁶³ EC, Sitting of Thursday, 12 May 2011, [2011] online: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu>>.