Among more authoritarian and conservative regimes, on the other hand, the policy responses veer much more towards the censoring end of the spectrum with, in some cases, complete isolation and containment of the population from exposure to the Internet. Iraq, for example, has banned access to the Internet, calling it a tool of American imperialism.[30] In Myanmar, not only is the Internet outlawed but mere possession of a computer laptop is a criminal offence punishable with a 15 year sentence.[31] Other states have taken a similar route, believing that the best way to protect cultural identity from the Internet environment is to isolate the cultural group altogether from it. To repeat, it is difficult to determine with certainty whether such a strategy is more a mechanism for *state* or *regime* survival or genuine concern with national and cultural identity. But the policy responses are, nonetheless, identical in each case.

In sum, the national security collective image portrays the Internet as a potential security threat to collective identities, with the nation or culture perceived to be the primary object of security. While this collective security image certainly does not dominate the landscape on Internet politics, it has colored the perspectives of several government ministries and countries around the world. The policy options pursued as a function of this collective image have ranged from complete isolation and containment to active state intervention and promotion of national expression on the Internet. The world order promoted by this collective image is a relatively insular system of *nation*-states.

---

[30] "Iraq: Internet Yet Another Tool of American Domination," <u>CNN Online</u> (February 17, 1997).