**Comprehension Questions**

1. Why did the UK abandon plans to force tech companies to remove harmful but legal online content?

A. The government has received lots of criticisms from the politicians and civic organizations

1. Which companies would have been affected by this proposed law?
2. The law can regulate the social media companies such as Google, Facebook, Twitter, and TikTok.
3. What are some of the changes that the government made to the bill?
4. In revised version of the law, tech corporations can allow adults to post and be exposed to harmful and unsatisfactory contents. However, if platforms who promised that they will ban those aggressive contents in their service do not implement their pledge, the government would charge fine to them.
5. What else does the bill criminalize?
6. Cyberflashing, epilepsy trolling, sending flashing images or videos, and self-harm and suicide contents are defined as crimes in the bill.

**Discussion Questions**

1. Do agree that “legal but harmful” content should be allowed on the internet? Why or why not?
2. Legal but harmful online content must be allowed. We need to focus on the word "legitimate" rather than the word "harmful." It is up to users to determine whether legal content is harmful or beneficial. If the government can restrict individual judgment, this could lead to the birth of Big Brother in the novel 1984. This is because censorship in the media can incite people in certain directions and block the public from raising problems in society. Also, harmfulness is judged by very common-sense standards. What is important here is that common sense is connected to public perception, and public perception changes over time. For example, jeans used to be a symbol of workers in the past, but now they have virtually lost their symbolism as a public garment. As such, the issue of media censorship should not be approached with short-sighted thinking because there will be many contents that are right in the past but not right in the present. This is because this issue is directly related to the true freedom of the public.
3. What do you think about the revised bill?
4. I don't think the amendments announced by the British Government are very effective. I think it is too much to actually embody the original purpose of the bill, as it merely tarnishes the image of IT companies. Companies that do not swear will be criticized by the public just because they do not swear, and companies that do swear will have to spend a lot of money censoring numerous contents one by one, while at the same time, they will be robbed of 10% of their annual profits if some mistakes occur. I think this puts a huge burden on platform companies in any case. If their services are just providing legal content, the government should no longer intervene. Excessive government interference in capitalist societies is often harmful. I think it is more desirable to educate users through various consultations, not financial attacks on companies, so that users can form their right values and select content.
5. How do you think this bill compares to the laws in Korea? Is it more strict or less strict? And in what ways?
6. The Republic of Korea does not seem to impose sanctions on platform companies for legal but harmful content, as in the UK. However, at the government level, various websites are designated, managed, and blocked as illegal harmful sites. From the perspective of content companies and platform companies, I think the legal system of Korea is more docile than the laws promoted by the UK. However, from the user's point of view, the intensity of censorship is similar, considering that content that the government does not want is eventually blocked. It is only different from the subject of censorship, but it is intended to be censored, and I think it is quite dangerous for both the UK and Korea to conduct the censorship. Rather, I think the Republic of Korea is implementing a policy to suppress people with different ideas by legislating biased laws based on some people's views.