

The Limits of control of Mexico's Internet

Los límites del control del Internet en México

Jardiel Legaspi Gutierrez
jlgdl7@hotmail.com

Lic. en Comunicación Pública
Universidad de Guadalajara
Centro Universitario de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades

RESUMEN

Internet, desde su creación, se pensó como un espacio de libre circulación de las ideas e información; pero su creación trajo también restricciones estructurales que controlan lo que se puede cargar en el vasto espacio virtual y cómo modificarlo. Algunos países han impuesto regulaciones en el pasado, como China, donde las leyes del mundo real afectan directamente al uso del mundo virtual. En los últimos meses, el presidente de México hizo una propuesta para aplicar regulaciones en el uso de Internet así como imponer licenciarios para proporcionar datos sobre los ciudadanos mexicanos. La ley presenta varios defectos, uno de ellos es la falta de claridad. Muchos ciudadanos ven este reglamento como opresivo, algunos otros piensan que Internet debe ser un lugar sin restricciones que garanticen la protección y el anonimato de los datos personales.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Identidad, Autenticación, Credenciales, regulaciones, privacidad, flujo de información, Proveedores de Servicios de Internet (ISP).

ABSTRACT

Since its creation, Internet was thought to be a space of free flow of ideas and information, but its creation also brought structural restrictions that control what can be uploaded into the vast virtual space and how this can be modified. Some countries have imposed regulations in the past, like China, where the laws of the real world affect directly the use of the virtual one. In recent months, Mexico's president made a proposal to apply regulations in the use of Internet and to impose licensees to provide data about Mexican citizens. The law presents several flaws; one of them is the lack of clarity. Many citizens see this regulation as oppressive, some other think that Internet should be a place with no restrictions that guarantees the protection and anonymity of personal data.

KEYWORDS

Identity, Authentication, Credential, regulations, privacy, flow of information, Internet Service Providers (ISP).

Recibido: mayo de 2015
Aceptado: julio de 2015



Introduction

A society where all the inhabitants are monitored at every moment and everywhere, whether at the office, their houses, or even at the moment of confessing their “sins” and thoughts against the system. This description is part of the story behind the movie directed by George Lucas in 1971, *THX 1138*. All the surveillance of the citizens is made through the city’s net and if someone attempts –or even think of– attacking the system, that person will suffer several consequences.

Although this is a fictional story –partly based on Orwell’s novel *1984*, and on Huxley’s *A Brave New World*, and on Dick’s novel *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*– something not very dissimilar could happen in Mexico.

In recent months –to be precise on March 24th 2014– the president of this country, Enrique Peña Nieto, sent to the Senate of the Republic a plan to reform the secondary laws of the telecommunications bill presented in 2013. Such reform presents several changes in the regulation of business competition when it comes to Television and Radio services. Not only that, but also to the companies that provide mobile communications and many regulations to the Internet services and uses. This latter point has caused discontent on one part of Mexican society, reaching the point of marching in several cities around the country advocating for the freedom of the net. The unhappiness was so big that even the hashtag #EPNvsInternet became a worldwide trending topic on the virtual platform *Twitter*.

This project will focus on the specific articles of such proposal that intend to modify the regula-

tion of the Internet. This delimits first the fact that not all the bill will be analyzed, and only the points concerning these regulations will be discussed.

The study of Internet regulation is not something new, perhaps it even started somewhat at the same time Internet began to expand and people started to have access to its different contents.

In his article, John McGuire (1999) analyzes the different regulations that exist in both the United States and Germany, presenting the similarities and differences in the constitution of each country and describing the concerns of both countries about pornography and information about extremist political groups –such as neo-Nazi websites– respectively. One of the options he describes on his articles is the use of *Firewalls*, this would serve as a “strainer” of contents; only the information approved by the government will be accessible for the users.

Something similar is described in Stevenson’s paper (2007). He presents how the structure of the so-called “Great Firewall of China’s” is organized, enforced by various agencies and laws put in place since 1996 and that have been changing over the years.

One of the aspects that allows China’s government to have a better control over the contents available in the country are the technical barriers that they have installed: the system works by accessing to the “greater Internet” only through a tier controlled by the State, which creates a big intranet within the country.

Another nation where Internet regulations can be observed is Singapore. Hwa Ang and Nada-



rajan (1996) present the basis from which the government of this country applies censorship mechanisms to its Internet users. Starting with more restricted contents to users accessing at home than to businesses, a heavier legal burden for contents directed to youngsters than to adults, public consumption is also more restricted than private one and a principle that states that materials that have artistic and educational value are less heavily censored.

The authors also point out to the problems of censoring the Internet, among others, the lack of a solid classification about what the Internet is. According to the authors, there are three regimes to the Internet, being classified as a telecommunications service, a computer service or a broadcast service. Singapore chose the latter and thus, the Singapore Broadcasting Authority –SBA– is the one that regulates whatever happens in the net.

In Mexico there is not a single regulatory organism that standardizes –or tries to– the Internet. One of the pretensions of the new reform is to give more regulatory power to the Federal Institute of Telecommunications –IFT for its acronym in Spanish– and to establish certain rules to other bureaus of the government.

There are specifically six articles that have caused the discomfort from several Mexican ci-

tizen¹s; these are the articles 145, 189, 190, 192, 194 and 197. They are briefly described next¹:

- **Article 145.** Authorized dealers and service providing access to Internet must be subject to the general guidelines issued to the effect that the Institute, as follows: –paragraph three– Privacy. They must preserve user privacy and security network. They could block certain content, applications or may block access to services at the specific request of the user, except upon order of authority or are contrary to some norm.

- **Article 189.** Telecommunications licensees and, where appropriate, the authorized are required to provide the real-time geographic location, of any type of communication device that is associated with research in organized crime, drug crimes, kidnapping, extortion or threats, at the request of the Attorney General's Office, the attorneys of the States or the agents of the Ministry Audience whom this power is delegated in accordance with the laws corresponding.

- **Article 190.** Telecommunications licensees and, where appropriate, the authorized ser-

THE STUDY OF INTERNET REGULATION IS NOT SOMETHING NEW, PERHAPS IT EVEN STARTED SOMEWHAT AT THE SAME TIME INTERNET BEGAN TO EXPAND AND PEOPLE STARTED TO HAVE ACCESS TO ITS DIFFERENT CONTENTS.

¹ The full proposal can be obtained (in Spanish) at: <http://www.presidencia.gob.mx/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/INICIATIVA-LEY-CONVERGENTE.pdf>



vice providers of application and content are required to permit, that the authorities empowered by law exercise the control and execution of the involvement of private communications and give them the support they request, in accordance with applicable laws.

- **Article 192.** Telecommunications dealers and, where applicable, the authorized, are required to keep a record and control of communications made from any device, in any form, enabling accurately identify the following information: a) Name or business name and address of the subscriber; b) communication and service type; c) Origin and destination of communications; d) The date, time and, where appropriate, duration of calls; e) Date, time and location of the initial activation of the service; f) If applicable, identification and technical characteristics of the devices, including, among others, the international identity code of manufacture equipment and subscriber; g) The geographical location of the device, and h) The other which surrendered the owner of the service, subscriber or registered for identification purposes.
- **Article 194.** Telecoms Grantees must submit the data conserved at the request of consulting from justice enforcement and security instances, according to their powers, in accordance with applicable laws.
- **Article 197.** In addition to the previous obligations, the telecommunications licensee and the authorized will have to: –paragraph three– Perform immediate suspension of services when so instructed by the competent authority pursuant to the applicable legal provisions. –Paragraph seven– Block,

inhibit or temporarily override telecommunications signals events and hot spots for public safety and at the request of national authorities.

One of the main points of discomfort is the vagueness of definition, especially in articles 145, 189, 190 and 192, which they do not clarify which ones are the “others authorized organisms” that can apply the laws. Another important concern is the geographic location and the shutdown of the service at moments where, with no specific definition, someone is attempting against “national security”. “Override the signal at events and hotspots for public safety” –once again, not clearly defined– has been viewed as a form to abolish freedom of speech from citizens.

All these attempts of regulation –viewed at a macro level as well– have implications that affect the use of Internet and are interesting not only from a communications studies perspective, but also from disciplines such as sociology, politics and the economics. Each of these fields of study can provide a different point of analysis and give a variety of conclusions.

This could be a very big and important change in Mexican society, and surely it would have implications on several aspects on the lives of citizens and in fields of study.

“The invisible hand of cyberspace is constructing an architecture that will perfect control and make highly efficient regulation possible” (Lessig, 2006, p.4). To better understand the changes that may –or may not occur– in Mexico, the basis of analysis will be based on Lessig’s concepts found in the new version of his book *Code. Version 2.0* (2006). This will allow presenting what are the structural characteristics of the net, in



which way the Internet can be controlled by monopolizing the code and what are the limits of privacy and free speech on the virtual world, as well as the limits of control of the net itself.

The way in which the Net has been built determines the interactions we, as users, can do in the virtual world. As Lessig puts it, the nature of the Net is the product of its design and this could allow the disclosure of personal information, including the location and actions users have done or are doing in real time (2006).

There are three ideas that Lessig explains related to the exposure of virtual information:

1. Identity. Includes name, sex, address, level of education, social security and driver's license number, your occupation and even "the purchases you have done on Amazon.com" (2006, p.39).
2. Authentication. This process, in theory, is controlled –or should be– by the same user. It is a matter of creating trust, and when it comes to the Net, that trust can be easily imitated and invented; that is why we also need a form that can assure a unique identity (Lessig 2006).
3. Credential. A tool that allow us to confirm our identity and keep it safe. Some are better than others and better technologies and credentials permit more distant authentication (Lessig 2006).

THE WAY IN WHICH THE NET HAS BEEN BUILT DETERMINES THE INTERACTIONS WE, AS USERS, CAN DO IN THE VIRTUAL WORLD.

In cyberspace these characteristics function by collecting data from the Internet Protocols addresses –IP– and by looking at other IP addresses that send bits of information to, –these are called packets– (Lessig 2006). This process does not identify "who" sent the information, rather, it only asserts "where" that particular information came from. If the objective is to know the identity and not only the address of the user, "that functionality should be performed by an application connected to the network, not by the network itself" (Lessig 2006, p. 43).

This last point is very important. In the Net, anonymity is the given and it is impossible to exactly know "who" is visiting or behaving in certain ways in cyberspace (Lessig 2006). Unless the IP address is traced to its owner, which in time, has to be done by looking at the Internet Service Provider's (ISP) records and reveal the identity of the user –or at least the owner, it could be the case that someone else

is using the IP address of another person– (Lessig 2006).

What this shows us is the fact that completely anonymity in cyberspace is not a fact and that the structure of the Net itself allows ways to identify the user on the web. It is important to mention that this kind of tracing is made indirectly. It is not made by one instance –the government looking at their own records, for instance– but through an intermediary –the ISP–. Those technologies regulate the behavior of users differently than made directly (Lessig 2006).



These regulations links to the idea of having better ways of virtual identification by using credentials that can connect what we do on-line to our identity. This of course having in mind better ways to protect who we are in the Net and other advantages that this carries, such as better commercial options and better ways to keep information with us wherever we go. This would make a change connected to the network.

But this idea also has a downside. If we allow a virtual ID that could contain all of our information –and use it the way we decide to use it– an easy way to impose a regulation would be to require certain data on websites, that is, to program “locks” that can be opened only by giving specific personal information. In this way, the government only needs to incentive individuals to present information by regulating intermediaries (Lessig, 2006).

Lessig (2006) also presents four constraints that regulate a user in the cyberspace; these are Law, Architecture, Norms and Market.

For the purposes of this work, the points made on Law –external law, made in the real world– and the Architecture of the Net will be considered. This due to the effect that the new laws presented by Mexico’s president would have both in the market and the norms of Mexican citizens and the changes that this legislation would bring to the architecture of the net, if the proposal is approved.

One of the main points that are at risk with this proposal is that it attempts to have total control over the privacy of the Internet users. Here, the concept of “digital surveillance” would be used to approach to this issue. This notion is defined by Lessig as “the process by which some form of human activity is analyzed by a computer according to some specified rule” (2006, p. 209).

There are three main conceptions to understand privacy. The first one does not seem to present a significant problem due to the burden of indiscriminate searching on the Net by the government, the searching goes imperceptible. The second one sees this searching as an offense to the dignity of the user, a search without justification harms whether or not interferes with your life. The third one is about preserving and limiting government power and what it can do with our information (Lessig, 2006).

As mentioned before, trust on the net is vital, thus,

to see if Internet users feel comfortable with the modifications on the law one hypothesis is presented: government will not be seen as trustworthy so as to have a record of personal information of the Net users. To obtain the results and support this claim a survey was applied to Mexican Internet users.

Methods

In order to gather evidence three steps were applied: 1) an evaluation of the proposal to see how these changes affect the freedom of the

ONE OF THE MAIN POINTS THAT ARE AT RISK WITH THIS PROPOSAL IS THAT IT ATTEMPTS TO HAVE TOTAL CONTROL OVER THE PRIVACY OF THE INTERNET USERS.



use of the Net; 2) newspapers were analyzed as well to see what they inform about the reform and to see if that information is clear and easy to understand for all the people; 3) finally, a survey was applied to people in Mexico (most of them students) to ask them about the reform, how this affect them and what do they think about concepts such as privacy and the freedom of the Net.

It is worth noting that a questionnaire was sent to all the participants, this presents the downside of not answering the doubts that may arise when they are responding the questionnaire. In order to attempt to solve this, a quick series of questions will be made to them to see if any doubts appeared when answering the questionnaire.

Results and Discussion

When reading the different articles it is easy to identify several points that are confusing. The article 145, on its first paragraph, states that Internet users could access to any content, application or service offered by the licensees, but in the third paragraph the law proposes that they could block certain content, applications or may block access to services. The article contradicts itself and never clarifies any of these issues.

Article 189 contemplates the obligation, of the licensees, to provide the geographic location of any device that is associated with research in organized crime, drug crimes, kidnapping, extortion or threats. In principle this sounds like a reasonable point to do such act, however, many of the discontent is the lack –again– of specificity, especially with the concept of threats which is not well defined and can be manipulated ea-

sily by the government to trace any device they would consider as threatening.

One of the main purposes of the proposal is to give total control to the government over the interventions and blocking of devices' signals, taking the Internet providers' infrastructure and looking at their databases. This is what the articles 190, 192 (this one gives specific details to identify users including name, date and address of the subscriber), 194 (requires that such information will be delivered to the authorities within 24 hours, third paragraph) and 197 (which goes deeply into all the kinds of blocking of contents in devices). They all state details that give government more and more control over the content on the Net, the practices of ISP's and the management of data.

The law imposes changes in the way the architecture of the Net functions by demanding licensees to basically serve to the interest of government. This type of control is indirect; this does not only affect the users, but to the ISPs as well. Costs may arise due to this legislation, and not only that, reliability of users on an ISP will decrease to the point of complete distrust on it and the lack of certainty of how his/her information is going to be used.

These changes facilitate the government the tracking of the identity, eliminates the process of authentication by simply looking at the data provided by the ISPs and virtual credentials since the government would have the capability of blocking content whenever and however they want to.

How are these changes presented in the news?² Many of the articles that explain the reform



²present the proposal as an attack towards the freedom of the Internet and speech. An article by Electronic Frontier Foundation even titles its article as a “Disaster for Internet Freedom” (May 5th).

Just a few articles display a more objective view about the reform and its possible effects. Only 2 out of 11 articles viewed presented the points that would be modified and gave a brief description of them. The rest of them give information based either on their own lecture of the proposal or by interviewing a researcher, a hacker or an association that advocates for Net’s freedom.

Other articles present information about the preliminary changes to the proposal. Specifically, the news articles detail the changes that senators intend to modify in order to get rid of the articles that censor the use of Internet. 5 out of 6 newspaper articles present the point of view of a politician; all of them give either a statement of discarding censorship on the Net or denying such censorship and claiming a wrong interpretation of the law. The other one presents the point of view of a researcher who affirms that the bill threatens the freedom of the Internet.

Eight op-eds were read; all of them but one

² All the links to the newspaper articles are available in the Appendix section.

follow the same line of the first type of articles, explaining the disadvantages that all these changes carry to the democracy and the censorship in the Internet. Some qualify the reform as reverse the advance of Internet and other said the net is at peril.

INTERVIEWEES DON'T BELIEVE REGULATIONS ARE NEEDED FOR A BETTER USE OF THE INTERNET. WHEN ASKED ABOUT ACCEPTING OR NOT THE GEOLOCATION OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES 8 OF THEM CONSIDER THIS SHOULD NOT BE DONE.

Protests and the postponition of the reform are other type of information that dailies have covered; it seems that the former had a big impact in the latter. The discussion and approval of the reform is thought to be completed between June the 9th and 13th.

Two characteristics are presented in almost all the articles. The discontent with the censorship and the intention to modify the law so it will not be too oppressive. This is true not only on the Mexican newspapers but also on the international news. The fact that there is a majority of articles that

present the legislation as negative is slightly balanced by the few articles where politicians give their point of view about the reform and the changes they will make, so it will not attempt against the freedom on the Net.

Most of the newspapers took one or another side. The most balanced one was *Milenio*, it was also the one that seemed to generate more information about this topic. The rest of them gave, in general terms, a more subjective point of view about the situation. This may be seen



as a biased whichview that does not generate enough points of action in respect to the discussion of this theme.

In respect to the audience, there are ideas that agree with the information presented in the newspapers. 19 people answered a questionnaire sent to them, 10 women and 9 men, most of them students. 15 of them fell in the range of 18-23-year old, 3 in the 24-29 group and one in the 30-35 segment. 14 of them navigate on the Net every day, while 5 do it six days a week. Almost of all those –16– navigate, primarily, on platforms like *Facebook* and *Twitter*.

Interviewees were given 5 options (None, Little, Moderate, Much, Very important) to select how important they considered was a subject. 10 of them consider Internet should be “Much” free, 3 selected “Moderate” and 6 stated it should be the freer medium (the Very important option). 11 think freedom of speech is “Very important”, 7 selected “Much” and 1 “Moderate”.

When asked about their knowledge of the proposal, only 4 didn’t know about it; the rest of them pointed out to pretty much all the newspaper articles presented. A few of them knew more about the details of the proposal but, in general, the regulation of the Internet and censorship were themes commonly mentioned.

Anonymity, protection of bank accounts data and guarantee of not divulgation of personal data, are some of the common mentions of privacy on the Internet. When asked how much information can be used by government and ISPs online, the results are mixed. 7 would proportionate voluntarily their information; 4 selected that all the information, never mind someone request it. On the contrary, 4 believe that their

information should remain anonymous no matter who requests it; 2 said that only the previous requested data; one stated that only what is authorized for that person can be used, and one wrote that, in a way, all the information on the Net is public, if you don’t want it to be used don’t put it there.

Interviewees don’t believe regulations are needed for a better use of the Internet. When asked about accepting or not the geolocation of electronic devices 8 of them consider this should not be done; 11 agree in first instance but do not think that government would make a good use of this data. In addition, there is uncertainty on how this would really work.

To test the hypothesis, interviewees had to select with whom they trust their personal data: government, ISPs or neither of them. Only one person selected the ISPs, the rest of the users, do not trust neither of them. This supports the hypothesis but it also shows the low levels of trust citizens have on both government and ISPs. Due to the uncertainty of how the data would be used, and a long history of inefficient resources management from part of the government, citizens have lost trust on them, especially on the government.

“Trust is of paramount importance in virtual groups, and lets trustworthy members get other member’s support” (Gattiker et al., 2001, p. 173). Different than what is presented by Gattiker on the creation of trust in virtual communities, the (old) levels of distrust in real life have led to a lack of confidence on the actions of Mexico’s government, which makes it particularly difficult to create levels of trust on the Net. This, along the lack of clarity in the proposal, creates a feeling of rejection from citizens. The previous



mentioned rallies are just one form to show the discontent of Mexicans about this legislation.

Conclusion

The general results show three main aspects: 1) a proposal not well defined, 2) mistrust on the government to apply these mechanisms, 3) rejection from citizens to accept these changes due to both the lack of clarity on the proposal and the high levels of distrust.

However the results, they do not comprise a general view of Mexican population. The number of interviewees is too low to claim. In addition, most of them are students or already graduated, this only shows the perception of a small targeted group. A bigger and varied sample is needed to make an approach of how citizens feel about the reform and what they think are the characteristics of the Internet and which regulations could –or not– be applied.

Moreover, it would be interesting to see what changes would be made to the proposal and what is going to be the final resolution to the telecommunications bill.

One point that is not clarified with the data presented is what would have happened had the ISPs had proposed such changes in the flow of information and data collection. Nonetheless, it also exists mistrust over them, as showed with the results for the hypothesis. It seems that no

matter who intends to establish regulations in the Internet, citizens will not accept them unless they are assured their information is going to be secured and utilize it only to purposes they authorize.

There are two things that need to be done in order to gain the acceptance of Mexican citizens in respect to regulating the Net. First –and easier to accomplish– is too clearly define the changes proposed in the law and make sure they will not attempt against the security and anonymity of users. Second –much more

complicated– is to start to generate confidence among citizens; something that has to start not in the virtual world, but in the real one. It would be almost impossible to create high levels of trust on the Internet due to the poor faith Mexicans have on the government. In this case, more than primarily generate mechanism of trust on the online community, the changes have to come from “outside”; something that

may well take several years to happen.

One question arises, would that be possible? For the government to do that, it will take more than assuring anonymity on the Net but to concentrate on giving solutions on other areas of the social sphere, such as national security, economic growth and the like. These aspects would indirectly start to make changes in the perception of citizens.

What would happened, for instance, if ISPs, but specially government, gives credible and positive

“TRUST IS OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE IN VIRTUAL GROUPS, AND LETS TRUSTWORTHY MEMBERS GET OTHER MEMBER’S SUPPORT.”



results with this reform on the Internet, would that change the perception of Mexican citizens over the reform and the way Mexican government acts? Could this generate higher levels of trust outside, in the real world?

It will be interesting to see what happens in the next weeks. Legislators will discuss the changes and possibly approve the reform between June the 9th and the 13th. Clarity and beneficial laws to the users are needed to start generating trust among them, a task that seems decidedly complicated³.

Epilogue

Another review of newspapers and the proposal confirm the desire of México's president stated above.

On July 14th 2014, the Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Law was reformed and presented by Enrique Peña Nieto who claimed that this law guarantee Internet's free access to all Mexicans, freedom of speech and net neutrality.

On one note from Mexican newspaper El Economista (November 20th) some of the benefits of the new law are presented, such as the reduction of costs for financial intermediaries, and as consequence, more participants to offer more financial services in the future.

Animal Político presents the report that the organization Freedom House, named "Tightening the Net: Governments Expand Online Controls", published on December 4th. On this report they present data that supports the information for the limits on content, violations of user rights, and they also point

³out to the lack of freedom of speech, press and privacy.

The future of net in Mexico is still uncertain, it will be important to see how it develops and what the consequences are due to this reform.

One thing is clear though, if government does not start to gain trust among Mexicans, the disputes will continue over this issue. On the other hand, it will be important for citizens in Mexico to better know what the Law states and understand its uses and practices.

³ The last review of newspapers present the desire of Peña Nieto to have settled the reform by the first two weeks of July (Excelsior note dated 9/6/14), whereas Senator Jorge Luis Preciado stated that the Senate is the one responsible to schedule the discussions and approval of the law (El Universal note dated 10/6/14). There is no certainty when this will be affirmed.



References

- Gattiker, Urs E. et al. (2001). "The virtual community: Building on social structure, relations and trust to achieve value". In *Our Virtual World: The Transformation of Work, Pay, and Life Via Technology*. Laku Chidambaram and Ilze Zigurs (eds.) Hershey, PA: Idea Group, 2001. pp. 166-190
- Hwa Ang, Peng and Nadarajan, Berlinda. (1996). "Censorship and the Internet: A Singapore Perspective". *Communications of the ACM*, 39 (6), 72-78.
- Law Initiative of the Federal Telecommunications Act and radio broadcasting. Senate. (2014). Retrieved -(in Spanish-) from: <http://www.presidencia.gob.mx/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/INICIATIVA-LEY-CONVERGENTE.pdf><http://www.presidencia.gob.mx/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/INICIATIVA-LEY-CONVERGENTE.pdf>
- Lessig, Lawrence. (2006). *Code. Version 2.0*. New York: Basic Books. Available online at: <http://codev2.cc/download+remix/>
- McGuire, John. (1999). "When Speech Is Heard Around the World: Internet Content Regulation in the United States and Germany". *New York Law Review*, 74 (3), 750- 792.
- Stevenson, Christopher. (2007). *Breaching the Great Firewall: China's Internet Censorship and the Quest for Freedom of Expression in a Connected World*, 30 B.C. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 531, <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/iclr/vol30/iss2/8><http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/iclr/vol30/iss2/8>

Appendix - Newspaper notes

- (Online version): Redaccive Aristegui Noticias. (2014, April 25). "Internet, tv, celulares... 13 claves de #LeyTelecom" ("Internet, TV, Cellphones... 13 Keys of #LeyTelecom"). Aristegui Noticias. Retrieved from <http://aristeguinoicias.com/2504/mexico/como-van-las-leyes-en-telecom-aqui-13-claves/> on May 26, 2014.
- (Online version): Hernández, A. (2014, May 3). Excelsior "La neutralidad en la red peligra" ("Network Neutrality is Endagered"). Excelsior. Retrieved from <http://www.excelsior.com.mx/hacker/2014/05/03/957160> on May 26, 2014.
- (Online version): Cabrera, R. (2014, April 7). Animal Politico "La iniciativa de Telecom es la más regresiva desde que internet existe en México" ("Telecom's initiative is the most regressive since Internet exists in Mexico"). Animal Político. Retrieved from <http://www.animalpolitico.com/2014/04/la-iniciativa-de-telecom-es-la-mas-regresiva-desde-que-internet-existe-en-mexico/#axzz3lkyChNHn> on May 26, 2014.



(Online version): Posada, M. (2014, April 1). La Jornada “AMIC llama a modificar ley secundaria en telecomunicaciones; es "preocupante" (“AMIC called secondary law change in telecommunications; is ‘preoccupying’). La Jornada. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/2014/04/01/piden-academicos-y-cientificos-modificar-legislacion-en-telecomunicaciones-5296.html> on May 27, 2014.

(Online version): Román, J.A. (2014, March 24). La Jornada “Este lunes envía Peña al Senado iniciativa de leyes secundarias en Telcom” (“On Monday, Peña sends initiative secondary laws in Telcom to the Senate”). La Jornada. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/2014/03/24/este-lunes-enviara-pena-al-senado-iniciativa-de-leyes-sekundarias-en-telecomunicaciones-9890.html> on May 31, 2014.

(Online version): Reporters without Borders Reporters without Borders (English). (2014, April 25). “NEW TELECOMS BILL THREATENS FREEDOM OF INFORMATION”. 4/25/2014 Reporters without Borders. Retrieved from <http://en.rsf.org/mexique-new-telecoms-bill-threatens-25-04-2014,46199.html> on May 28, 2014.

(Online version): Galperin, E. Electronic Frontier Foundation (English) (2014, May 5). “Proposed Mexican Telecom Law Would Be a Disaster for Internet Freedom”. 5/5/2014 Electronic Frontier Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2014/05/proposed-mexican-telecom-law-would-be-disaster-internet-freedom> on May 29, 2014.

(Online version): Martínez, M., Dompínguez, A. (2014, March 25). Milenio “Qué es la Ley Federal de Telecomunicaciones y Radiodifusión” (“What is the Federal Telecommunications Act and Broadcasting?”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/negocios/Telecomunicaciones-ley_telecomunicaciones-telecom-facultades_Segob-facultades_IFT_0_268773665.html on May 26, 2014.

(Online version): Corona, J., Sánchez, A. (2014, April 22) Milenio “¿Ley telecom afecta libertad en internet?” (“Telecom Law affects Internet freedom?”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/politica/Ley_telecom-libertad_en_internet-censura_internet-sct-libre_acceso_a_internet_0_285571594.html on May 28, 2014.

(Online version): Mendieta, S. (2014, April 2). Milenio “En riesgo, libre acceso a internet: expertos” (“At risk, free access to internet: experts”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/negocios/telecom/riesgo-libre-acceso-internet-expertos_0_273572662.html on May 29, 2014.

(Online version): Mejía Barquera, F. (2014, April 24). Milenio “Dictamen de Lozano, nueva censura” (“Lozano’s dictum, New Censorship”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/firmas/fernando_mejia_barquera/Dictamen-Lozano-nueva-censura_18_286951321.html



on May 26, 2014.

Censorship Discarded

(Online version): Redacción Aristegui Noticias. (2014, April 23). “Habrá cambios a #LeyTelecom; descartada, censura al internet: Gamboa” (“There will be updates to # LeyTelecom; internet censorship discarded: Gamboa”). Aristegui Noticias. Retrieved from <http://aristeguinoticias.com/2304/mexico/habra-cambios-a-leytelecom-descarta-censura-al-internet-gamboa/> on May 30, 2014.

(Online version): Rueda, R. (2014, April 23). El Financiero “No habrá censura en leyes de telcos: PRI y SCT” (“There will be no censorship telcos laws: PRI and SCT”). El Financiero. Retrieved from <http://www.elfinanciero.com.mx/politica/no-habra-censura-en-leyes-de-telcos-pri-y-sct.html> on May 30, 2014.

(Online version): Pacheco, R. Excelsior (2014, April 23). “Ley Telecom no criminaliza a usuarios de Internet: PRI” (“Telecom Act does not criminalize Internet users: PRI”). Excelsior. Retrieved from <http://www.excelsior.com.mx/nacional/2014/04/23/955469> on May 26, 2014.

(Online version): Milenio Digital. (2014, April 23). Milenio “Ley telecom no censura internet: Ruiz Esparza” (“Telecom law does not censor internet: Ruiz Esparza”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/negocios/telecom/ley_telecom-telecomunicaciones-internet-SCT-Ruiz_Esparza-censura_internet_0_286171712.html on May 26, 2014.

(Online version): Ruíz, B. (2014, April 24). Milenio “Leyes Telecom sí amenazan acceso libre a internet: investigador” (“Telecom laws do threaten free internet access: researcher”). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/region/Leyes-Telecom-amenazan-internet-investigador_0_286771517.html on May 31, 2014.

(Online version): Cabrera, R. (2014, April 22). Animal Político “Restricciones a Internet quedan fuera de dictamen de reforma #Telecom: Lozano” (“Internet restrictions are outside dictum # Telecom reform: Lozano”). Animal Político. Retrieved from <http://www.animalpolitico.com/2014/04/lanzan-frentes-contra-reforma-telecom-hoy-presentan-predictamen/#axzz33SyEpw> on June 2, 2014

Protests

(Online version): Martínez, A. (2014, April 12). El Financiero “Se unen en defensa de la neutralidad del internet” (“Unite in defense of the neutrality of the internet”). El Financiero. Retrieved from <http://www.elfinanciero.com.mx/tech/se-unen-en-defensa-de-la-neutralidad-del-internet.html> on May 30, 2014 4/14/2014



(Online version): Montes, J. The Wall Street Journal (English) (2014, April 23). "Social Media Protests in Mexico Shape Telecom Bill. The Wall Street Journal." Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304788404579519633220313644> on June 2, 2014

(Online version): Dávila, R. (2014, May 7). Activistas crean sitio web para impulsar debate sobre leyes secundarias en telecomunicaciones (Activists create website to promote debate on secondary legislation in telecommunications). La Jornada. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/2014/05/07/activistas-crean-sitio-web-para-impulsar-debate-sobre-leyes-secundarias-en-telecomunicaciones-4833.html> on May 31, 2014

Reform postponed

(Online version): Rueda, R. (2014, April 23). Queda a discusión dictamen de telecom (Still in discussion dictum of telecom). El Financiero. Retrieved from <http://www.elfinanciero.com.mx/politica/queda-a-discusion-dictamen-de-telecom.html> on May 31, 2014

(Online version): Associated Press. (English) (2014, April 23). Mexican government appears to step back from telecom, Internet limits. Fox News. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2014/04/23/mexican-government-appears-to-step-back-from-telecom-internet-limits/> on May 26, 2014

(Online version): Redacción Aristegui Noticias (2014, June 2). Discusión de leyes en telecom también coincidiría con el Mundial (Discussion of telecom laws would also coincide with the World Cup). Aristegui Noticias. Retrieved from <http://aristeginoticias.com/0206/mexico/discusion-de-leyes-en-telecom-tambien-coincidirian-con-el-mundial/> on June 2, 2014

(Online version): Notimex. (2014, May 30). Ley telecom, antes del Mundial: Lozano (Telecom law before World Cup: Lozano). CNN Expansión. Retrieved from <http://www.cnnexpansion.com/negocios/2014/05/30/telecom-antes-de-15-de-junio-lozano> on June 2, 2014

(Online version): Notimex. (2014, June 9). Peña Nieto espera leyes de Telecom y energética antes de julio (Peña Nieto expects Telecom and energy laws before July). Excélsior. Retrieved from <http://www.excelsior.com.mx/nacional/2014/06/09/964135> on June 10, 2014

(Online version): Arvizu, J., Morales, A. (2014, June 10). Los tiempos de las reformas los fija el congreso: PAN (Times for reforms are set by the Congress: PAN). El Universal. Retrieved from <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/nacion-mexico/2014/acuerdos-calendario-reformas-armonizacion-1016148.html> on June 10, 2014



Op-eds

(Online version): Aristegui Noticias. (2014, April 4). Restringir internet es “atacar la libertad de expresión”: Zimmermann (Restrict internet is “attacking freedom of expression”: Zimmermann). Aristegui Noticias. Retrieved from <http://aristeguinoticias.com/0904/mexico/restringir-internet-es-atacar-la-libertad-de-expresion-zimmermann> on May 31, 2014

(Online version): Padierna, D. (2014, April 14). La reforma peñista, contra el Internet libre (The Peña reform, against free Internet). El Financiero. Retrieved from <http://www.elfinanciero.com.mx/opinion/la-reforma-penista-contra-el-internet-libre.html> on May 31

(Online version): Shahani, A. (English) (2014, April 2). Will Mexico's Telecom Reform Hurt Internet Freedom? Quarterly Americas. Retrieved from <http://www.americasquarterly.org/content/pena-nieto-v-internet> on May 26, 2014

(Online version): Pérez, C. (2014, April 9). Ataque directo a la libertad de expresión, la iniciativa de Peña en telecomunicaciones (Direct attack on freedom of expression, Peña's telecommunications initiative). La Jornada. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2014/04/09/politica/023n1pol> on May 26

(Online version): Alonso, R. (2014, March 31). Reversa en materia de telecomunicaciones (Reverse in telecommunications). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/firmas/ruben_alonso/Reversa-materia-telecomunicaciones_18_272552802.html on May 30, 2014

(Online version): Gómez, P. (2014, April 25). Censura de internet (Internet Censorship). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/firmas/pablo_gomez/Censura-internet_18_287551277.html on May 26, 2014

(Online version): Pérez González, J. (2014, April 11). Peligra el internet (Internet at peril). Milenio. Retrieved from http://www.milenio.com/firmas/jorge_alberto_perez_gonzalez/Peligra-internet_18_279152089.html on May 30, 2014

(Online version) Sánchez, R. (2014, April 21). El berrinche tuitero por el Internet en la reforma de telecomunicaciones (I) (The Twitter tantrum of Internet telecommunications reform (I)). SDP Noticias. Retrieved from <http://www.sdpnoticias.com/columnas/2014/04/21/el-berrinche-tuitero-por-el-internet-en-la-reforma-de-telecomunicaciones-ion> May 26, 2014

Reform approved

(Online version): Redacción Animal Político (2014, December 4). Ley telecom en México viola



derechos de los usuarios de internet: Freedom House (Mexico telecom law violates the rights of internet users: Freedom House). Animal Político. Retrieved from <http://www.animalpolitico.com/2014/12/las-nuevas-legislaciones-en-telecomunicaciones-violan-los-derechos-de-los-usuarios-de-internet-asegura-freedom-house/> on December 5, 2014

(Online version): Vargas, R., Posada, M. (2014, July 14). Peña Nieto promulga la Ley Federal de Telecomunicaciones y Radiodifusión (Peña Nieto promulgates the Federal Telecommunications Act and Broadcasting). La Jornada. Retrieved from <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/2014/07/14/pena-nieto-promulgara-hoy-la-ley-federal-de-telecomunicaciones-y-radiodifusion-5219.html> on November 22, 2014

(Online version): Notimex. (2014, November 14). Reforma en telecom 'empareja piso' para inclusión financiera (Telecom reform 'matches floor' to financial inclusion). El Economista. Retrieved from <http://eleconomista.com.mx/sistema-financiero/2014/11/20/reforma-telecom-empareja-piso-inclusion-financiera><http://eleconomista.com.mx/sistema-financiero/2014/11/20/reforma-telecom-empareja-piso-inclusion-financiera> on November 22, 2014

The Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Law can be consulted both in Spanish and English on <http://www.sct.gob.mx/comunicaciones/ley-federal-de-telecomunicaciones-y-radiodifusion/>

