The Amateur Computerist

Table of Contents

Introduction

This issue of the *Amateur Computerist* includes articles written over a spread of 26 years. Michael Hauben wrote his article "The Net and Netizens: The Impact the Net Has on People's Lives" in 1992-3 and posted an early draft online on June 10, 1993. Based on this article, Michael gave a talk in 1994 to the students and faculty in the student ACM chapter at Columbia University. That talk is featured as the first article in this issue. Michael's article was posted originally in 1993. It was then published in the print edition of *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* in May 1997. And, since 1994, there have been numerous books and articles quoting from Michael's article.

Other articles in this issue include the Wikipedia entry for "Michael

Hauben" (p. 13) and his analysis of "The Impact of the Internet on the Emerging Global Culture" (p. 21). There are two articles by Ronda Hauben about the Significance of the Net and the Netizen and about a Vision for the Future of the Net shown by the 2008 Candlelight demonstrations in South Korea. The issue concludes with a summary of experiences at the 6th World Internet Conference in China and then an analysis of culture and social media in the Philippines.

Also in this issue is the text of a short talk Ronda Hauben was invited to present at the 6th World Internet Conference held in Wuzhen, China. Ronda's talk, "The Netizen as the Emerging New Form of Citizenship," was presented as part of the Cyberculture and Youth sub forum held on Oct. 21, 2019. In her talk Ronda quoted from a journal article written to discuss efforts by Turkish netizens to encourage friendship between the Greek and Turkish people using Facebook posts. In the journal article, the Turkish scholars quote from Michael's article, the "The Net and the Netizens..." as a description of what these efforts toward Greek -Turkish people's friendship represent. Quoting Michael, the Turkish authors of the paper write that a Netizen (net citizen) exists "as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible."

In 1993, Michael noted he was making "only a prediction of the future." But this prediction has, in many ways, now become the present reality for netizens around the world as it has for Turkish and Greek netizens. This demonstrates that Michael's netizen discovery was an important scientific discovery that gave a name and recognition to a phenomena that at the time was only coming into being.

The recognition of the importance of the netizen phenomena has intermittently received prominent acknowledgment. And, still 26 years later it was presented at the Cyberculture and Youth sub forum at the 6th World Internet Conference. The 140 Chinese and international attendees heard how "The Netizen is the Emerging New Form of Citizenship" as a contribution to the vision for the future made possible not only by the Net but also by the Netizen.

Researching the "Net"
A Talk on The Evolution of Usenet News and The Significance of the Global Computer Network

by Michael Hauben

I – You Are a Netizen or a Net Citizen

Welcome to the 21st Century. You are a Netizen, or a Net Citizen, and you exist as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible. You consider everyone as your compatriot. You physically live in one country but you are in contact with much of the world via the global computer network. Virtually you live next door to every other single Netizen in the world. Geographical separation is replaced by existence in the same virtual space.

The situation I describe is only a prediction of the future, but a large part of the necessary infrastructure currently exists. The Net – or the Internet, BITNET, FIDOnet, other physical networks, Usenet, VMSnet, and other logical networks and so on – has rapidly grown to cover all of the developed countries in the world. Every day more computers attach to the existing networks and every new computer adds to the user base – at least twenty five million people are interconnected today. Why do all these people pass their time sitting in front of a computer typing away? They have very good reason to! Twenty five million people plus [in 1994] have very good reason not to be wrong.

[Twenty-five years later, in 2019, there were 4.3 billion active internet users.]

We are seeing a revitalization of society. The frameworks are being redesigned from the bottom up. A new more democratic world is becoming possible. According to one user, the Net has "immeasurably increased the quality of…life." The Net seems to open a new lease on life for people. Social connections which were never before possible, or which were relatively hard to achieve, are now facilitated by the Net. Geography and time no longer are boundaries. Social limitations and conventions no longer prevent potential friendships or partnerships. In this manner Netizens are meeting other Netizens from far-away and close by that they might never have met without the Net.

A new world of connections between people – either privately from individual to individual or publicly from individuals to the collective mass of many on the net – is possible. The old model of central distribution of information from the Network Broadcasting or Publication Company is being questioned and challenged. The top-down model of information being distributed by a few for mass-consumption is no longer the only News. Netnews brings the power of the reporter to the Netizen. People now have the ability to broadcast their observations or questions around the world and have other people respond. The computer networks form a new grassroots connection that allows the excluded sections of society to have a voice. This new medium is unprecedented. Previous grassroots media have existed for much smaller-sized selections of people. The model of the Net proves the old way does not have to be the only way of networking. The Net extends the idea of networking – of making connections with strangers that prove to be advantageous to one or both parties.

The complete connection of the body of citizens of the world that the Net makes possible does not exist as of today, and it will definitely be a fight to make access to the Net open and available to all. However, in the future we might be seeing the possible expansion of what it means to be a social animal. Practically every single individual on the Net today is available to every other person on the Net. International connection coexists on the same level with local connection. Also the computer networks allow a more advanced connection between the

people who are communicating. With computer-communication systems, information or thoughts are connected to people's names and electronic-mail addresses. On the Net, one can connect to others who have similar interests or whose thought processes they enjoy.

Netizens make it a point to be helpful and friendly – if they feel it to be worthwhile. Many Netizens feel they have an obligation to be helpful and answer queries and follow-up on discussions to put their opinion into the pot of opinions. Over a period of time the voluntary contributions to the Net have built it into a useful connection to other people around the world. The Net can be a helpful medium to understand the world. Only by seeing all points of view can any one person attempt to figure out either their own position on a topic or in the end, the truth.

Net Society differs from off-line society by welcoming intellectual activity. People are encouraged to have things on their mind and to present those ideas to the Net. People are allowed to be intellectually interesting and interested. This intellectual activity forms a major part of the on-line information that is carried by the various computer networks. Netizens can interact with other people to help add to or alter that information. Brain-storming between varieties of people produces robust thinking. Information is no longer a fixed commodity or resource on the Nets. It is constantly being added to and improved collectively. The Net is a grand intellectual and social commune in the spirit of the collective nature present at the origins of human society. Netizens working together continually expand the store of information worldwide. One person called the Net an untapped resource because it provides an alternative to the normal channels and ways of doing things. The Net allows for the meeting of minds to form and develop ideas. It brings people's thinking processes out of isolation and into the open. Every user of the Net gains the role of being special and useful. The fact that every user has his or her own opinions and interests adds to the general body of specialized knowledge on the Net. Each Netizen thus becomes a special resource valuable to the Net. Each user contributes to the whole intellectual and social value and possibilities of the Net.

II – Licklider, the Visionary

The world of the Netizen was envisioned some twenty five-years ago [now over 50] by J.C.R. Licklider and Robert Taylor in their article "The Computer as a Communication Device" (*Science and Technology*, April 1968). Licklider brought to his leadership of the U.S. Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) a vision of "the intergalactic computer network." Whenever he would speak of ARPA, he would mention this vision. J.C.R. Licklider was a prophet of the Net. In his article Licklider establishes several helpful principles which would make the computer play a helpful role in human communication. These principles were:

1. Communication is defined as an interactive creative process.
2. Response times need to be short to make the "conversation" free and easy.
3. The larger network would form out of smaller regional networks.
4. Communities would form out of affinity and common interests.

Licklider focused on the Net comprising of a network of networks. While other researchers of the time focused on the sharing of computing resources, Licklider kept an open mind and wrote:

> ...The collection of people, hardware, and software – the multi-access computer together with its local community of users – will become a node in a geographically distributed computer network…. Through the network, therefore, all the large computers can communicate with one another. And through them, all the members of the super-community can communicate – with other people, with programs, with data, or with a selected combinations of those resources.

Licklider's understandings from his 1968 paper have stood the test of time, and do represent what the Net is today. His concept of the sharing of both computing and human resources accurately describes today's Net. The networking of various human connections quickly forms, changes its goals, disbands and reforms into new collaborations. The fluidity of such group dynamics leads to a quickening of the creation of new ideas. Groups can form to discuss an idea, focus in or

broaden out and reform to fit the new ideas that have resulted from the process.

The virtual space created on non-commercial computer networks is accessible universally. This space is accessible from the connections that exist; whereas social networks in the physical world generally are connected only by limited gateways. So the capability of networking on computer nets overcomes limitations inherent in non-computer social networks. This is important because it reduces the problems of population growth. Population growth no longer means limited. Rather that very growth of population now means an improvement of resources. Thus growth of population can be seen as a positive asset. This is a new way of looking at people in our society. Every new person can mean a new set of perspectives and specialties to add to the wealth of knowledge of the world. This new view of people could help improve the view of the future. The old model looks down on population growth and people as a strain on the environment rather than the increase of intellectual contribution these individuals can make. However, access to the Net needs to be universal for the Net to fully utilize the contribution each person can represent. Once access is limited, the Net and those on the Net lose the full possible advantages the Net can offer. Lastly the people on the Net need to be active in order to bring about the best possible use of the Network.

Licklider foresaw that the Net allows for people of common interests, who are otherwise strangers, to communicate. Much of the magic of the Net is the ability to make a contribution of your ideas, and then be connected to utter strangers. He saw that people would connect to others via this net in ways that had been much harder in the past. Licklider observed as the ARPANET spanned two continents. This physical connection allowed for wider social collaborations to form. This was the beginning of Computer Data networks facilitating connections of people around the world.

My research on and about the Net has been and continues to be very exciting for me. When I posted my inquiries, I usually received the first reply within a couple of hours. The feeling of receiving that very first reply from a total stranger is always exhilarating! That set of first replies from people reminds me of the magic of E-Mail. It is nice that

there can be reminders of how exciting it all is – so that the value of this new use of computers is never forgotten.

III – Critical Mass

The Net has grown so much in the last 25 years, that a critical mass of people and interests has been reached. This collection of individuals adds to the interests and specialties of the whole community. Most people can now gain something from the Net, while at the same time helping it out. A critical mass has developed on the net. Enough people exist that the whole is now greater than any one individual and thus makes the Net worthwhile to be part of. People are meshing intellects and knowledge to form new ideas. Larry Press made this clear by writing:

> I now work on the Net at least 2 hours per day. I've had an account since around 1975 but it has only become super important in the last couple of years because a critical mass of membership was reached. I no longer work in LA, but in cyberspace.

Many inhabitants of the Net feel that only the most technically inclined people use the Net. This is not true, as many different kinds of people are now connected to the Net. While the original users of the Net were from exclusively technical and scientific communities, many of them found it a valuable experience to explore the Net for more than just technical reasons. The nets, in their early days, were only available in a few parts the world. Now however, people of all ages, from most parts of the globe, and of many professions, make up the Net. The original prototype networks (e.g.: ARPANET in the USA, NPL in the United Kingdom, CYCLADES in France and other networks around the world) developed the necessary physical infrastructure for a fertile social network to develop. Einar Stefferud wrote of this social connection in an article:

> The ARPANET has produced several monumental results. It provided the physical and electrical communications backbone for development of the latent social infrastructure we now call 'The Internet Community.'
> (*ConneXions*, Oct. 1989, Vol. 3 No. 10. p. 21)

Many different kinds of people comprise the Net. The University Community sponsors access for a broad range of people (students, professors, staff, professor emeritus, and so on). Programmers, engineers and researchers from many companies are connected. A K-12 Net exists within the lower grades of education which helps to invite young people to be a part of our community. Special Bulletin Board software (for example Waffle) exists to connect Personal Computer users to the Net. Various UNIX bulletin board systems exist to connect other users. It is impossible to tell exactly who connects to public bulletin board systems, as only an inexpensive computer (or terminal) and modem are required to connect. Many common bulletin board systems (for example, FIDO board) have at least e-mail and many also participate through a gateway to Netnews. Prototype Community Network Systems are forming around the world (e.g.: In Cleveland – the Cleveland Freenet, In New Zealand – the Wellington Citynet, In California – the Santa Monica Public Electronic Network, etc.) Access via these community systems can be as easy as visiting the community library and membership is open to all who live in the community.

In addition to the living body of resources this diversity of Netizens represent, there is also a continually growing body of digitized data that forms a set of resources. Whether it is Netizens digitizing great literature of the past (e.g.: the Gutenberg Project), or it is people gathering otherwise obscure or non-mainstream material (e.g.: Various Religions, unusual hobbies, fringe and cult materials, and so on), or if it is Netizens contributing new and original material (e.g.: the *Amateur Computerist* Newsletter), the net follows in the great tradition of other public bottom-up institutions, such as the public library or the principle behind public education. The Net shares with these institutions that they serve the general populace. This data is just part of the treasure. Often living Netizens provide pointers to this digitized store of publicly available information. Many of the network access tools have been programmed with the principle of being available to everyone. The best example is the method of connecting to file repositories via FTP (file transfer protocol) by logging in as an "anonymous" user. Most (if not all) World Wide Web Sites, Wide Area Information Systems (WAIS), and gopher sites are open for all users of the Net. It is true that the cur-

rent membership of the Net Community is smaller than it will be, but the net has reached a point of general usefulness no matter who you are.

All of this evidence is exactly why there could be problems if the Net comes under the control of commercial entities. Once commercial interests gain control, the Net will be much less powerful for the ordinary person than it is currently. Commercial interests vary from those of the common person. They attempt to make profit from any available means. Compuserve is an example of one current commercial network. A user of Compuserve pays for access by the minute. If this scenario would be extended to the Net of which I speak, the Netiquette of being helpful would have a price tag attached to it. If people had to pay by the minute during the Net's development, very few would have been able to afford the network time needed to be helpful to others.

The Net has only developed because of the hard work and voluntary dedication of many people. It has grown because the Net is under the control and power of the people at a bottom-level, and because these people have over the years made a point to make it something worthwhile. People's posts and contributions to the Net have been the developing forces.

IV – Network as a New Democratic Force

For the people of the world, the Net provides a powerful way of peaceful assembly. Peaceful assembly allows for people to take control over their lives, rather than that control being in the hands of others. This power has to be honored and protected. Any medium or tool that helps people to hold or gain power is something that is special and has to be protected. (See "The Computer as Democratizer," *Amateur Computerist* Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 5, Fall 1992)

J.C.R. Licklider believed that access to the then growing information network should be made ubiquitous. He felt that the Net's value would depend on high connectivity. In his article, "The Computer as a Communication Device," Licklider argues that the impact upon society depends on how available the network is to the society as a whole. He wrote:

For the society, the impact will be good or bad depending mainly on the question: Will 'to be on line' be a

privilege or a right? If only a favored segment of the population gets a chance to enjoy the advantage of 'intelligence amplification,' the network may exaggerate the discontinuity in the spectrum of intellectual opportunity.

The Net has made a valuable impact to human society. I have heard from many people how their lives have been substantially improved via their connection to the Net. This enhancement of people's lives provides the incentive needed for providing access to all in society. Society will improve if net access is made available to people as a whole. Only if access is universal will the Net itself truly advance. The ubiquitous connection is necessary for the Net to encompass all possible resources. One Net visionary responded to my research by calling for universal access. Steve Welch wrote:

If we can get to the point where anyone who gets out of high school alive has used computers to communicate on the Net or a reasonable facsimile or successor to it, then we as a society will benefit in ways not currently understandable. When access to information is as ubiquitous as access to the phone system, all hell will break loose. Bet on it.

Steve is right, "all hell will break loose" in the most positive of ways imaginable. The philosophers Thomas Paine, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and all other fighters for democracy would have been proud.

Similar to past communication advances such as the printing press, mail, and the telephone, the Global Computer Communications Network has already fundamentally changed our lives. Licklider predicted that the Net would fundamentally change the way people live and work. It is important to try to understand this impact, so as to help further this advance.

Considerations on the Significance of the Net and the Netizens*

by Ronda Hauben

Topics: netizens, communication processes, communication channels, citizen empowerment, models for democracy, nerves of government, social impact

Abstract

The book *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* celebrates in 2017 the 20th anniversary of its publication in English and Japanese editions in 1997. The book documents how along with the development of the Internet came the emergence of a new form of citizen – the netizen. In his pioneering online research in the early 1990s Michael Hauben gathered data and did analysis demonstrating that not only the Internet but also the netizen would have an important impact on society. This article explores Hauben's research recognizing that netizens are a new social force. The article also looks at other contributions which help to provide a conceptual framework to understand this new social force. Media theorist Mark Poster's work about netizens is discussed, as is Karl Deutsch's theoretical understanding of the role of communication in creating a new model for good government. But it is the candlelight revolution by citizens and netizens in 2016-2017 in South Korea which demonstrates in practice the importance of the netizen forging a new governance model for participatory democracy.

Key Words: netizens, communications, empowerment, impact, citizen, watchdog, democracy

Introduction

With the introduction of the Internet, the question has been raised as to what its impact will be on society. One significant result of the impact already is the emergence of the netizen. Michael Hauben's work in the 1990s recognized the significant impact not only of the develop-

ment of the Internet but also of the role of the netizen in forging new social and political forms and processes.

While the role of netizens in working for social change has been documented around the world, the role of netizens in working for social and political change has been an especially important aspect of South Korean experience for nearly the past two decades. Most recently, however, widespread political and economic corruption at the highest levels of the South Korean society has led citizens and netizens to take part in peaceful but massive candlelight demonstrations advocating the need for fundamental change in the political and economic structures of South Korean society. The question has been raised whether there are models for such change. In such an environment there is a need to consider the importance of the Internet and of the Netizen in helping to forge the new forms for grassroots participation in the governing structures of society. At such a time it seems appropriate to consider the conceptual framework for the role of the netizen in contributing to a new governing model for society

These developments in South Korea come at a time when the book *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* celebrates the 20th anniversary since its publication in 1997, making a review of the significant contribution of the book particularly relevant to the events of our time.

Looking Back

Twenty years ago in May 1997, the print edition of *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* was published in English. Later that year, in October, a Japanese translation of the book was published. In 2017, we are celebrating the occasion of the 20th Anniversary of these publications.

In honor of this occasion I want to both look back and forward toward trying to assess the significance of the book and of Michael Hauben's discovery of the emergence of the netizen. I want to begin to consider what has happened in these 20 years toward trying to understand the nature of this advance and the developments the advance makes possible.

By the early 1990s, Hauben recognized that the Internet was a significant new development and that it would have an impact on our world. He was curious about what that impact would be and what could help it to be a beneficial impact. He had raised a series of questions about the online experience. He received responses to these questions from a number of people. Reading and analyzing the responses he explained:

> There are people online who actively contribute to the development of the Net. These people understand the value of collective work and the communal aspects of public communications. These are the people who discuss and debate topics in a constructive manner, who e-mail answers to people and provide help to newcomers, who maintain FAQ files and other public information repositories, who maintain mailing lists, and so on. These are the people who discuss the nature and role of this new communications medium. These are the people who as citizens of the Net I realized were Netizens.

The book was compiled from a series of articles written by Hauben and his co-author Ronda Hauben which were posted on the Net as they were written and which sometimes led to substantial comments and discussion.

The most important article in the book was Hauben's article, "The Net and Netizens: The Impact the Net Has on People's Lives." Hauben opened the article with the prophetic words, which appeared online first in 1993:

> Welcome to the 21st Century. You are a Netizen (a Net Citizen) and you exist as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible. You consider everyone as your compatriot. You physically live in one country but you are in contact with much of the world via the global computer network. Virtually, you live next door to every other single Netizen in the world. Geographical separation is replaced by existence in the same virtual space.[1]

Hauben goes on to explain that what he is predicting is not yet the reality. In fact, many people around the world were just becoming connected to the Internet during the period in which these words were written and posted on various different networks that existed at the time.

But now twenty years after the publication of the print edition of *Netizens*, this description is very much the reality for our time and for many it is hard to remember or understand the world without the Net.

Similarly, in his articles that are collected in the *Netizens* book, Hauben looked at the pioneering vision that gave birth to the Internet. He looked at the role of computer science in the building of the earlier network called the ARPANET, at the potential impact that the Net and Netizen would have on politics, on journalism, and on the revolution in ideas that the Net and Netizen would bring about, comparing this to the advance brought about by the printing press. The last chapter of the book is an article Hauben wrote early on about the need for a watchdog function over government in order to make democracy possible.

By the time the book was published in a print edition, it had been freely available online for three years. This was a period when the U.S. government was determined to change the nature of the Net from the public and scientific infrastructure that had been built with public and educational funding around the world to a commercially driven entity. While there were people online at the time promoting the privatization and commercialization of the Internet, the concept of netizen was embraced by others, many of whom supported the public and collaborative nature of the Internet and who wanted this aspect to grow and flourish.

The article "The Net and Netizens" grew out of a research project that Hauben had done for a class at Columbia University in Computer Ethics. Hauben was interested in the impact of the Net and so he formulated several questions and sent them out online. This was a pioneering project at the time and the results he got back helped to establish the fact that already in 1993 the Net was having a profound impact on the lives of a number of people.

Hauben put together the results of his research in the article "The Net and Netizens" and posted it online. This helped the concept of

netizen to spread and to be embraced around the world. The netizen, it is important to clarify, was not intended to describe every net user. Rather netizen was the conceptualization of those on the Net who took up to support the public and collaborative nature of the Net and to help it to grow and flourish. Netizens at the time often had the hope that their efforts online would be helpful toward creating a better world.

Hauben described this experience in a speech he gave at a conference in Japan. Subsequently in 1997, his description became the preface to the *Netizens* book, Hauben explained:

> In conducting research five years ago online to determine people's uses of the global computer communications network, I became aware that there was a new social institution, an electronic commons, developing. It was exciting to explore this new social institution. Others online shared this excitement. I discovered from those who wrote me that the people I was writing about were citizens of the Net or Netizens.[2]

Hauben's work which is included in the book and the subsequent work he did recognized the advance made possible by the Internet and the emergence of the Netizen.

The book is not only about what is wrong with the old politics, or media, but more importantly, the implications for the emergence of new developments, of a new politics, of a new form of citizenship, and of what Hauben called the "poor man's version of the mass media." He focused on what was new or emerging and recognized the promise for the future represented by what was only at the time in an early stage of development.

For example, Hauben recognized that the collaborative contributions for a new media would far exceed what the old media had achieved. "As people continue to connect to Usenet and other discussion forums," he wrote, "the collective population will contribute back to the human community this new form of news."[3]

In order to consider the impact of Hauben's work and of the publication of the book, both in its online form and in the print edition, I want to look at some of the implications of what has been written since about netizens.

Mark Poster on the Implications of the Concept of Netizen

One interesting example is in a book on the impact of the Internet and globalization by Mark Poster, a media theorist. The book's title is *Information Please*. The book was published in 2006. While Poster does not make any explicit reference to the book *Netizens* he finds the concept of the netizen that he has seen used online to be an important one. He offers some theoretical discussion on the use of the "netizen" concept.

Referring to the concept of citizen, Poster is interested in the relationship of the citizen to government, and in the empowering of the citizen to be able to affect the actions of one's government. He considers the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen* as a monument from the French Revolution of 1789. He explains that the idea of the Rights of Man was one effort to empower people to deal with governments. But this was not adequate though the concept of the rights of the citizen, he recognizes, was an important democratic milestone.

"Human rights and citizenship," he writes, "are tied together and reinforce each other in the battle against the ruling classes."[4] He proposes that "these rights are ensured by their inscription in constitutions that found governments and they persist in their association with those governments as the ground of political authority."[5]

But with the coming of what he calls the age of globalization, Poster wonders if the concept "citizen" can continue to signify democracy. He wonders if the concept is up to the task.

"The conditions of globalization and networked media," he writes, "present a new register in which the human is recast and along with it the citizen."[6] "The deepening of globalization processes strips the citizen of power," he writes. "As economic processes become globalized, the nation-state loses its ability to protect its population. The citizen thereby loses her ability to elect leaders who effectively pursue her interests."[7]

In this situation, "the figure of the citizen is placed in a defensive position."[8] To succeed in the struggle against globalization he recognizes that there is a need to find instead of a defensive position, an offensive one.

Also he is interested in the media and its role in this new paradigm. "We need to examine the role of the media in globalizing practices that construct new subjects," Poster writes. "We need especially to examine those media that cross national boundaries and to inquire if they form or may form the basis for a new set of political relations."[9]

In this context, for the new media, "the important questions, rather, are these:" he proposes, "Can the new media promote the construction of new political forms not tied to historical, territorial powers? What are the characteristics of new media that promote new political relations and new political subjects? How can these be furthered or enhanced by political action?"[10]

"In contrast to the citizen of the nation," Poster notices, the name often given to the political subject constituted on the Net is "netizen." While Poster makes it seem that the consciousness among some online of themselves as "netizens" just appeared online spontaneously, this is not accurate.

Before Hauben's work, netizen as a concept was rarely if ever referred to. The paper "The Net and Netizens" introduced and developed the concept of "netizen." This paper was widely circulated online. Gradually the use of the concept of netizen became increasingly common. Hauben's work was a process of doing research online, summarizing the research, analyzing it while welcoming online comments at various stages of the process and then putting the research back online, and of people embracing it. This was the process by which the foundation for the concept of "netizen" was interactively established.

Considering this background, the observations that Poster makes of how the concept of "netizen" is used online represents a recognition of the significant role for the netizen in the future development of the body politic. "The netizen," Poster writes, "might be the formative figure in a new kind of political relation, one that shares allegiance to the nation with allegiance to the Net and to the planetary political spaces it inaugurates."[11]

This new phenomena, Poster concludes, "will likely change the relation of forces around the globe. In such an eventuality, the figure of the netizen might serve as a critical concept in the politics of democratization."[12]

The Era of the Netizen

Poster characterizes the current times as the age of globalization. I want to offer a different view, the view that we are in an era demarcated by the creation of the Internet and the emergence of the netizen. Therefore, a more accurate characterization of this period is as the "Era of the Netizen."

The years since the publication of the book *Netizens* have been marked by many interesting developments that have been made possible by the growth and development of the Internet and the spread of netizens around the world. I will refer to a few examples to give a flavor of the kind of developments I am referring to.

An article by Vinay Kamat in the Reader's Opinion section of the *Times of India* referred to something I had written. Quoting the article "The Rise of Netizen Democracy", the *Times of India* article said, "Not only is the Internet a laboratory for democracy, but the scale of participation and contribution is unprecedented. Online discussion makes it possible for netizens to become active individuals and group actors in social and public affairs. The Internet makes it possible for netizens to speak out independently of institutions or officials."[13]

Kamat points to the growing number of netizens in China and India and the large proportion of the population in South Korea who are connected to the Internet. "Will it evolve into a fifth estate?" Kamat asks, contrasting netizens' discussion online with the power of the 4th estate, i.e. the mainstream media.

"Will social and political discussion in social media grow into deliberation?" asks Kamat. "Will opinions expressed be merely 'rabble rousing' or will they be 'reflective' instead of 'impulsive'?"

One must recognize, Kamat explains, the new situation online and the fact that it is important to understand the nature of this new media and not merely look at it through the lens of the old media. What is the nature of this new media and how does it differ from the old? This is an important area for further research and discussion.

Looking for a Model

When visiting South Korea in 2008, I was asked by a colleague if there is a model for democracy that could be helpful for South Korea – a model implemented in some country, perhaps in Scandinavia. Thinking about the question I realized it was more complex than it seemed on the surface.

I realized that one cannot just take a model from the period before the Internet, from before the emergence of the netizen. It is instead necessary that models for a more democratic society or nation, in our times, be models that include netizen participation in the society. Both South Korea and China are places where the role not only of citizens but also of netizens is important in building more democratic structures for the society. South Korea appears to be the most advanced in grassroots efforts to create examples of netizen forms for a more participatory government decision making process.[14] But China is also a place where there are significant developments because of the Internet and netizens.[15]

In China there have been a large number of issues that netizens have taken up online which have then had an impact on the mainstream media and where the online discussion has helped to bring about a change in government policy.

In looking for other models to learn from, however, I also realized that there is another relevant area of development. This is the actual process of building the Net, a prototype which is helpful to consider when seeking to understand the nature and particularity of the evolving new models for development and participation represented in the Era of the Netizen.[16]

In particular, I want to point to a paper by the research scientist who many computer and networking pioneers credit with providing the vision to inspire the scientific work to create the Internet. This scientist is JCR Licklider, an experimental psychologist who was particularly interested in the processes of the brain and in communication research.

In a paper Licklider wrote with another psychologist, Robert Taylor, in 1968 a vision was set out to guide the development of the Internet. The title of the paper was "The Computer as a Communication Device."[17] The paper proposed that essential to the processes of com-

munication is the creation and sharing of models. That the human mind is adept at creating models, but that the models created in a single mind are not helpful in themselves. Instead it is critical that models be shared and a process of cooperative modeling be developed in order to be able to create something that many people will respect.[18]

Nerves of Government

In his article comparing the impact of the Net with the important impact the printing press had on society, Hauben wrote, "The Net has opened a channel for talking to the whole world to an even wider set of people than did printed books."[19] I want to focus a bit on the significance of this characteristic, on the notion that the Net has opened a communication channel available to a wide set of people.

In order to have a conceptual framework to understand the importance of this characteristic, I recommend the book by Karl Deutsch titled, The *Nerves of Government*. In the preface to this book, Deutsch writes:

This book suggests that it might be preferable to look upon government somewhat less as a problem of power and somewhat more as a problem of steering; and it tries to show that steering is decisively a matter of communication.[20]

To look at the question of government not as a problem of power, but as one of steering, of communication, I want to propose is a fundamental paradigm shift.

What is the difference?

Political power has to do with the ability to exert force on something so as to affect its direction and action. Steering and communication, however, are related to the process of the transmission of a signal through a channel. The communication process is one related to whether a signal is transmitted in a manner that distorts the signal or whether it is possible to transmit the signal accurately. The communication process and the steering that it makes possible through feedback

mechanisms are an underlying framework to consider in seeking to understand what Deutsch calls the "Nerves of Government."

According to Deutsch, a nation can be looked at as a self-steering communication system of a certain kind and the messages that are used to steer it are transmitted via certain channels.

Some of the important challenges of our times relate to the exposure of the distortions of the information being spread. For example, the misrepresentations by the mainstream media about what happened in Libya in 2011 or what has been happening in Syria since 2011.[21] The creation and dissemination of channels of communication that make possible "the essential two-way flow of information" are essential for the functioning of an autonomous learning organization, which is the form Deutsch proposes for a well-functioning system.

To look at this phenomenon in a more practical way, I want to offer some considerations raised in a speech given to honor a Philippine librarian, a speech given by Zosio Lee. Lee refers to the kind of information that is transmitted as essential to the well being of a society. In considering the impact of netizens and the form of information that is being transmitted, Lee asks the question, "How do we detect if we are being manipulated or deceived?"[22]

The importance of this question, he explains, is that, "We would not have survived for so long if all the information we needed to make valid judgments were all false or unreliable." Also, he proposes that "information has to be processed and discussed for it to acquire full meaning and significance."[23] "When information is free, available and truthful, we are better able to make appropriate judgments, including whether existing governments fulfill their mandate to govern for the benefit of the people," Lee writes.[24]

In his article "The Computer as a Democratizer," Hauben similarly explores the need for accurate information about how government is functioning. He writes, "Without information being available to them, the people may elect candidates as bad as or worse than the incumbents. Therefore, there is a need to prevent government from censoring the information available to people."[25]

Hauben adds that, "The public needs accurate information as to how their representatives are fulfilling their role. Once these representa-

tives have abused their power, the principles established by [Thomas Paine] and [James] Mill require that the public have the ability to replace the abusers."[26]

Channels of accurate communication are critical in order to share the information needed to determine the nature of one's government.[27]

Conclusion

The candlelight revolution is still in process in South Korea. It is demonstrating in practice that we are in a period when the old forms of government are outmoded. The paper by Licklider and Taylor proposes that the computer is a splendid facilitator for cooperative modeling. It is such a process of cooperative modeling that offers the potential for creating not only new technical and institutional forms, but also new political forms. Such new political forms are more likely to provide for the democratic processes that are needed for the 21st century. Hence it is the efforts of citizens and netizens who are involved in collaborative modeling to create the more participatory forms and structures as is happening during the candlelight processes being explored in South Korea that provide for the development of a more equitable and democratic society.[28]

References/Citations

1. Hauben, M., R. Hauben, (1997), *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society Press, p. 3. Also available online in an earlier draft version, http://www.columbia.edu/~rh120/. Retrieved on Jan. 18, 2017.
2. *IBID*., p. ix.
3. *IBID*., p. 233.
4. Poster, M., (2006). *Information Please*. Durham: Duke University Press, p. 68.
5. *IBID*.
6. *IBID*., p. 70.
7. *IBID*., p. 71.
8. *IBID*.
9. *IBID*., p. 77.
10. *IBID*., p. 78.
11. *IBID*.

12. *IBID*., p. 83.

13. Kamat, V. (2011, December 16), "We are looking at the Fifth Estate," Reader's Opinion, *Times of India*, p. 2. http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/edit-page/ampnbsp We-are-looking-at-the-fifth-estate/articleshow/11133662.cms, Retrieved on Jan. 10, 2017. The quote is taken from Hauben, R. "The Rise of Netizen Democracy: A Case Study of Netizens' Impact on Democracy in South Korea" http://www.columbia. edu/~rh120/other/misc/korean-democracy.txt, Retrieved on Jan. 10, 2017.

14. In South Korea there are many interesting examples of new organizational forms or events created by netizens. For example, Nosamo combined the model of an online fan club and off-line gathering of supporters who worked to get Roh Moo-hyun elected as President in South Korea in 2002. Also, *OhmyNews*, an online newspaper, helped to make the election of Roh Moo-hyun possible. Science mailing lists and discussion networks contributed to by netizens helped to expose the fraudulent scientific work of a leading South Korean scientist. And in 2008 there were 106 days of candlelight demonstrations contributed to by people online and off to protest the South Korean government's adoption of a weakened set of regulations about the import of poorly inspected U.S. beef into South Korea. The debate on June 10-11, 2008 over the form the demonstration should take involved both online and off-line discussion and demonstrated the generative nature of serious communication. See for example, Hauben, R. "On Grassroots Journalism and Participatory Democracy." http://www. columbia.edu/~rh120/other/netizens_draft.pdf, Retrieved on Jan. 10, 2017.

15. Some examples include the Anti-CNN web site that was set up to counter the inaccurate press reports in the western media about the riot in Tibet. The murder case of a Chinese waitress who killed a Communist Party official in self defense. The case of the Chongqing Nail House and the online discussion about the issues involved. See for example, Hauben, R. (2010, February 14). "China in the Era of the Netizen." http:// blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2010/02/14/china_in_the_era_of__the__netizen/, Retrieved on Jan. 10, 2017.

16. *IBID*., *Netizens.*

17. "The Computer as a Communication Device," (1968, April) *Science and Technology*. http://memex.org/licklider. pdf, pp. 21-41. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2017.

18. The Licklider and Taylor paper also points out that the sharing of models is essential to facilitate communication. If two people have different models and do not find a way to share them, there will be no communication between them.

19. *IBID*., *Netizens*, p. 299

20. Deutsch, K., (1966), *Nerves of Government*, New York, The Free Press, p. xxvii.

21. See for example, Hauben, R., (2012, Winter), "Libya, the UN and Netizen Journalism," *The Amateur Computerist*, Vol. 21, No. 1. http://www.ais.org/~jrh/ acn/ACn21-1.pdf, Retrieved Jan. 10, 2017 and Hauben, J., (2007), "On the 15th Anniversary of Netizens: Netizens Expose Distortions and Fabrication." http://www.columbia.edu/ ~hauben/Book_Anniversary /presentation_2.doc, Retrieved on Jan. 10, 2017.

22. Lee, Z. (2011), "Truthfulness and the Information Revolution," *JPL* 31, p. 105.

23. IBID., p. 106.

24. IBID., p. 108.
25. *IBID*., *Netizens*, p. 316.
26. *IBID*., *Netizens*, p. 317.
27. M. Hauben explains: "Thomas Paine, in *The Rights of Man*, describes a fundamental principle of democracy. Paine writes, 'that the right of altering the government was a national right, and not a right of the government'." (*Netizens*, Chapter 18, p. 316)
28. Hauben, R., (2016, December 21), "Ban Ki-moon's Idea of Leadership or the Candlelight Model for More Democracy?," http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2016/12/21/leadership-or-candlelight-democracy/, Retrieved on Jan. 21, 2017.

Bibliography

Deutsch, K. (1966). *Nerves of Government*. New York: The Free Press. New York.
Hauben, M. & Hauben, R. (1997). *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. Los Alamitos: IEEE Computer Society Press. Online edition: http:// www.columbia.edu/~rh120, Retrieved on Jan. 11, 2017.
Hauben, R. (2005). "The Rise of Netizen Democracy: A Case Study of Netizens' Impact on Democracy in South Korea." Unpublished paper. Retrieved from http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/ronda2014/Rise_of_Netizen_Democracy.pdf, Retrieved on Jan. 11, 2017.
Komat, V. (2011, December 16, p. 2). Reader's Opinion: "We're Looking at the Fifth Estate." *Times of India.* Retrieved from http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/opinion/edit-page/We-are-looking-at-the-fifth-estate/opinions/11133662.cms, Retrieved on Jan. 11, 2017.
Lee, Z. E. (2011). "Truthfulness and the Information Revolution," *Journal of Philippine Librarianship*, 31. pp. 101-109. http://journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/jpl/art i cle/viewFile/2779/2597. Retrieved on Jan. 11, 2017.
Licklider, JCR, & Taylor, R. "The Computer as a Communication Device." (1968, April). *Science and Technology*. http://memex.org/licklider.pdf. pp. 21-41. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2017.
Poster, M. (2006). *Information Please*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Michael Hauben

Michael Frederick Hauben (May 1, 1973 – June 27, 2001) was an Internet theorist and author. He pioneered the study of the social impact of the Internet. Based on his interactive online research, in 1993 he coined the term and developed the concept of Netizen to describe an Internet user who actively contributes toward the development of the Net and acts as a citizen of the Net and of the world. Along with Ronda Hauben, he co-authored the 1997 book *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*.[1] Hauben's work is widely referenced in many scholarly articles and publications about the social impact of the Internet.

Early Life

Hauben was born on May 1, 1973 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Jay and Ronda Hauben. He was an active participant in the Bulletin Board System (BBS) communities in the Detroit/Ann Arbor area in Michigan where his family had moved.

Work and Scholarship

Hauben participated in the founding meetings of the *Amateur Computerist*[2] in 1987. From 1991 to 1997 he attended Columbia University in NYC, earning a BA in Computer Science (Columbia College 1995) and an MA in Communication (Teachers College 1997). During his studies at CU, Hauben did much of his original research and writing. He was all that time an active employee of the CU Academic Information Systems (AcIS), serving for one year as a Postmaster and Consultant for Electronic Mail.

Hauben was co-author of the book *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, a draft of which was put online in 1994. Print editions in English (IEEE Computer Society Press) and Japanese (Chuokoron-Sha, Inc.[3]) were published in 1997. Based on his in-

teractive online research, Hauben coined the term 'Netizen' and introduced it into popular use. In the Preface to *Netizens*, Hauben wrote: "My initial research concerned the origins and development of the global discussion forum Usenet…. I wanted to explore the larger Net and what it was and its significance. This is when my research uncovered the remaining details that helped me to recognize the emergence of Netizens. There are people online who actively contribute towards the development of the Net. These people understand the value of collective work and the communal aspects of public communications. These are the people who discuss and debate topics in a constructive manner, who e-mail answers to people and provide help to new-comers, who maintain [FAQ](FAQ) files and other public information repositories, who maintain mailing lists, and so on. These are people who discuss the nature and role of this new communications medium. These are the people who as citizens of the Net I realized were Netizens." Hauben observed that, "The word citizen suggests a geographic or national definition of social membership. The word Netizen reflects the new non-geographically based social membership. So I contracted the phrase net.citizen to Netizen."[4]

His 1993 article "Common Sense: The Impact the Net Has on People's Lives"[5] was an analysis of responses Hauben received to questions he posted on newsgroups and mailing lists. The article begins:

> Welcome to the 21st Century. You are a Netizen (a Net Citizen), and you exist as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible. You consider everyone as your compatriot. You physically live in one country but you are in contact with much of the world via the global computer network. Virtually, you live next door to every other single Netizen in the world. Geographical separation is replaced by existence in the same virtual space.

This article became Chapter One of *Netizens*.

While still an undergraduate, Hauben began to develop a theoretical framework for his vision of the social impact of the net and the netizens. In his article "The Expanding Commonwealth of Learning: Printing and the Net,"[6] he applied his study of the Printing Revolution

especially the work of Elizabeth Eisenstein to an analysis of the trajectory in which the Internet and netizens are taking society. He wrote, "Comparing the emergence of the printing press to the emergence of the global computer network will reveal some of the fascinating parallels which demonstrate how the Net is continuing the important social revolution that the printing press had begun." Quoting Hauben's work, one author wrote, "On the extraordinary explosion of knowledge with the Gutenberg printing press, see Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe.* On the intellectual foundation of the Internet actually being based on the Gutenberg printing press, see Hauben, The Expanding Commonwealth of Learning: Printing and the Net."[7]

Using a similar method of analysis, Hauben found insights about the Internet in the understandings of the 19th Century Scottish philosopher James Mill about the importance of "liberty of the press". He argued that the net was making it possible for citizens as netizens to be the watchdogs over governments which Mill argued was the function of liberty of the press. In a footnote to his article "The Computer as a Democratizer,"[8] referring to Usenet, Hauben wrote that "the discussions are very active and provide a source of information that makes it possible to meet James Mill's criteria for both more oversight over government and a more informed population. In a sense, what was once impossible, is now possible."

Hauben was invited to Japan in 1995 by Shumpei Kumon, sociology professor and director of GLOCOM (the Japanese Center for Global Communication).[9] In Japan, Hauben was welcomed in Tokyo at GLOCOM and then in Oita by members of COARA,[10] the computer network community in Beppu. At the Hypernetwork '95 Beppu Bay Conference,[11] Hauben spoke about "The Netizens and Community Networks."[12] He was interviewed by the local Nisshi-Nippon Press. Then in Kyoto, he attended two network conferences and was an honored guest at a reception with the Mayor. Hauben was a speaker also at the GLOCOM Intelprise-Enterprise Collaboration Program (IECP). Throughout his stay in Japan, Hauben met Japanese computer and network enthusiasts to discuss the growing importance of this new medium and his vision of netizenship. Hauben also appeared in documentaries about the Internet on TV Tokyo and in write-ups in newspapers in To-

kyo and Oita. Prof. Kumon included a chapter by Hauben in his 1996 book *The Age of the Netizen*. In 1997, the Japanese translation of *Netizens: On the History and impact of Usenet and the Internet* was published in a run of 5000 copies.

When he returned home from Japan, Hauben broadened his vision of the impact the Internet and the netizens would have on society. He saw in the work of the American anthropologist Margaret Mead that even in the 1960s a global culture was emerging. Using the writings of Mead, he countered the critics who claimed that the Internet's mass culture was snuffing out cultural differences. He saw instead that "more and more people of various cultures are understanding the power of the new communication technologies. More and more people are reacting against the mass media and corporate dominance and calling for a chace to express their views and contribute their culture into the global culture." Hauben presented his analysis of Internet culture at the 1997 IFIP WG 9.2/9.5 conference in Corfu, Greece.[13]

Hauben also explored the question whether participatory democracy and netizenship are related. He studied the Port Huron Statement created in 1962 by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other sources to see what lessons he could learn about the 1960s that would help to understand the importance of the Internet and the emergence of the netizens. He opened his analysis with the observation that "the 1960s was a time of people around the world struggling for more of a say in the decisions of their society…. People rose up to protest the ways of society which were out of their control…." Hauben's conclusion was that "the development of the Internet and emergence of the netizens is an investment in a strong force toward making direct democracy a reality. The new technologies present the chance to overcome the obstacles preventing the implementation of direct democracy. Online communication forums also make possible the discussion necessary to identify today's fundamental questions."[14]

Hauben was an avid music fan. He was a DJ of ambient techno music on WBAR,[15] the Barnard College student radio station. With Min-Yen Kan he developed one of the original web sites for band listings, the *Ever Expanding Web Music Listing!*[16] In 1996, an article in *The Daily Herald* (Chicago, IL) described the Ever Expanding Web

Music Listing as "probably the World Wide Web's most comprehensive one-stop resource for all things musical."[17] In the late 1990s, Hauben did online reviews of live music performances in New York City. He was concerned that the youth music scene in NYC not slip into drugs and commercial dominance. He analyzed trends in youth music culture and sent out pointers to upcoming events.[18] He saw peer-to-peer music reviews as an alternative to commercial advertising.

Influence of Hauben's Work

In the second half of the 1990s, the Internet rapidly spread around the world. Online and off-line, the term netizen was becoming widely used. Scholars began to refer to Hauben's research. For example, the Polish scholar and diplomat Leszek Jesien,[19] quoting Hauben, urged the European political leaders to look at netizenship as a possible model for a new European citizenship. Boldur Barbat, a Romanian scientist, reviewed *Netizens* concluding it is a catalyst for the continuing of information technology and an optimistic future.[20] Citing Hauben's work, Cameroonian sociologist Charly G Mbock[21] saw netizenship as a necessary component of any fight against corruption and as a sign of hope for "a more equitable sharing of world resources through efficient interactions." Turkish educator Dr. E. Özlem Yiğit[22] and Palestinian scholar Khaled Islaih[23] also referred to Hauben as a source of their understandings of the importance of netizenship for their respective communities. Hauben's work on netizens and the Internet is known in China and has influenced how some academics and government officials analyze the impact of the Internet on society.[24] In his study of new media and social media in the Philippines, Aj Garchitorena, as some of his theoretical foundation, cited Hauben's work especially Hauben's "Theory of the Netizen and the Democratisation of Media."[25] Garchitorena also built on Hauben's insight that the net "brings the power of the reporter to the Netizen."

With its spread, two general uses of the term netizen developed. Hauben explained, "The first is a broad usage to refer to anyone who uses the Net, for whatever purpose…. The second usage is closer to my understanding… people who care about Usenet and the bigger Net and work toward building the cooperative and collective nature which bene-

fits the larger world. These are people who work towards developing the Net…. Both uses have spread from the online community, appearing in newspapers, magazines, television, books and other off-line media. As more and more people join the online community and contribute toward the nurturing of the Net and toward the development of a great shared social wealth, the ideas and values of Netizenship spread. But with the increasing commercialization and privatization of the Net, Netizenship is being challenged." He called on scholars, "to look back at the pioneering vision and actions that have helped make the Net possible and examine what lessons they provide." He argued that is what he and the *Netizens* book tried to do.[26]

One contributor to the 2004 celebration of the 250th Anniversary of Columbia University in New York City, referring to Hauben's contribution wrote, "While the prevalence and universality of the Internet today may lead some to take it for granted, Michael Hauben did not. A pioneer in the study of the Internet's impact on society, Hauben helped identify the collaborative nature of the Internet and its effects on the global community."[27]

Legacy

After sustaining injuries resulting from an accident in December 1999 when he was hit by a taxi, Hauben died in New York City[28] on June 27, 2001, a victim of suicide. At the time of his death, he had lost a job, accumulated a large credit card debt, and was about to lose his apartment.[29]

The significance of Hauben's contribution to the appreciation of the emergence of the netizen is a deeper sense that the Internet is accompanied by an expansion of the fullness of human empowerment. In 2012, cultural anthropologist Shirley Fedorak summed up Hauben's contribution. She wrote. "Studies have found that greater participation in the political landscape is influenced by access to information…. Indeed, Michael Hauben identified a new form of citizenship emerging from widespread use of the Internet. Hauben coined the term netizens, and he considered them crucial for building a more democratic human society. These individuals are empowered through the Internet and use

it to solve socio-political problems and to explore ways of improving the world."[30]

Bibliography

- *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. published May 1997. by IEEE Computer Society Press. (ISBN 0-8186-7706-6)
- "Culture and Communication," chapter in *The Ethical Global Information Society: Culture and Democracy Revisited*. Jacques Berleur and Diane Whitehouse. Editors, IFIP, pp. 197–202. published 1997 by Chapman & Hall.
- "Netizens." in *CMC Magazine*. February 1997. http://www.december.com/cmc/ mag/1997 /feb/hauben.html
- "Birth of Netizens," chapter in The Age of Netizens., Shumpei Kumon. published 1996 by NTT Press, ISBN 4-87188-461-9
- "Netizens" in *The Thinker*. Vol. 2, No. 5. February 2, 1996. p. 1. Stanford University.
- "Online Public Discussion and the Future of Democracy." in *Proceedings Telecommunities 95: Equity on the Internet*. Victoria, B.C, Canada.
- Co-author, "Interview with Henry Spencer: On Usenet News and C News," chapter in *Internet Secrets*. edited by John R. Levine and Carol Baroudi. published 1995. by IDG Books.
- "Exploring New York City's Online Community," in *CMC Magazine*. May 1995. http://www.ibiblio.org/cmc/ mag/1995/may/hauben.html
- "Participatory Democracy From the 1960s and SDS into the Future Online." 1995. reprinted in *Amateur Computerist* Vol. 11 No. 1. http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/ ACn11-1.pdf
- "A New Democratic Medium: The Global Computer Communications Network," in *HKCUS Quarterly*. No. 14, July 1994. p. 26. Special Issue on Hong Kong Media Facing 1997.

References

1. Michael Hauben and Ronda Hauben, *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, May 1997 http://www.wiley .com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0818677066.html
2. *The Amateur Computerist* Newsletter 1988-present http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/ acnindex2.html
3. *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* (Japanese), Chuokoron-Sha, October 1997, ISBN 4120027333
4. Michael Hauben, "Preface: What is a Netizen?" in *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, pp. ix-xi http://www.columbia.edu/~rh 120/ch106.txt

5. Michael Hauben, "Common Sense: The Net and Netizens," Part I/III, alt.culture.usenet, July 6, 1993 https://groups.google.com/forum/#!msg/alt.culture .usenet/M-C3Kq2ssRY/ hY66QIJA_I8J

6. Michael Hauben, "The Expanding Commonwealth of Learning: Printing and the Net" in *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, pages 291-304 http://www.columbia.edu/ ~rh120/ch106.x16

7. Gerald L. Stevens, *Revelation: The Past and Future of John's Apocalypse*, Pickwick, 2014 ISBN 978-1-62564-549-4, p. 131 https://books.google.com/books?id= JhqQBAAAQBAJ &pg =PA131

8. Michael Hauben, "The Computer as a Democratizer," in *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, pp. 315-320 http://www.columbia.edu/ ~hauben/ronda 2014/demo cratizer.pdf

9. Center for Global Communications, International University of Japan (GLOCOM) http://www.glocom.ac.jp/e/

10. Mieko and Kenichi Nagano, "A memory of Michael Hauben, the inventor of NETIZEN," Oita, Japan, August 6, 2001 http://www.coara.or.jp/~mieko/hauben /hauben.htm

11. (Hypernetwork '95 Beppu Bay Conference), Oita, Japan, Nov. 23-25, 1995 http://www.coara.or.jp/BBC/url.html

12. Michael Hauben, "The Netizens and Community Networks," *CMC Magazine*, February 1997 http://www.decem ber.com/cmc/mag/1997/feb/hauben.html

13. Michael Hauben, "Culture and Communication," in *The Ethical Global Information Society: Culture and Democracy Revisited*, Jacques Berleur and Diane Whitehouse, Editors, IFIP, Chapman & Hall, 1997, pp. 197–202 https://archive. org/stream/springer_10.1007-978-0-387-35327-2/10.1007-978-0-387-35327-2_dj vu.txt

14. Michael Hauben, "Participatory Democracy From the 1960s and SDS into the Future On-line," Columbia University, 1995 http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/ CS/netdemocracy-60s.txt

15. WBAR: Barnard College Freeform Radio http://www.wb ar.org/

16. Michael Hauben and Min-Yen Kan, "Ever Expanding Web Music Listing!" (1991-2001) http://www.columbia.edu/~hau ben/music/web-music.html

17. "CYBERSPACE: The Internet rocks! Here's your guide to getting plugged in," *The Daily Herald* (Chicago, IL), January 26, 1996, p. 56 https://www.newspapers. com/newspage/128 98495/

18. Michael Hauben, "The Netizens Cyberstop Music Page" (last modified: Oct 19, 1996) http://www.columbia.edu/~hau ben/music/index.html

19. Leszek Jesien, "The 1996 IGC: European Citizenship Reconsidered," Instituts für den Donauraum und Mitteleuropa (IDM), March, 1997 http://www.columbia .edu/~hauben/Era_of_the_Netizen/resources/European_Citizenship_Reconsidered-LJesien.doc

20. Boldur Barbat, "Review of Netizens," *Studies in Informatics and Control Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 4, Bucharest, December 1998 http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/Era_of_the_Netizen/ resources/Review_of_Netizens-BBarbat.txt

21. Charly Gabriel Mbock, "Social Sciences and the Social Development Process in Africa." in *Social Sciences and Innovation*, OECD, 2001, pp. 157-172 https://books.google.com/books?id =LncFo1_SDxcC&pg=PA157

22. E. Özlem Yiğit, "Pre-Service Social Studies Teachers' Perspectives Towards Netizenship," *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol. 13 Issue 2, April 2014, pp. 123-124 http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ10229 18.pdf

23. Khaled Islaih, "Palestinian Diaspora: Building Transnational Capital," *Palestine Economic*, Policy Research Institute, 2011, p. 18 http://www.mas.ps/files/server/20141911094704-1.pdf

24. Yun Tang, Lifeng Sun, Hai Qin, Shiqiang Yang, and Yuzhuo Zhong, "When Most Quickly Developing Technique Meets with Most Quickly Developing Country: Towards Understanding Internet in China," pp. 2 and 3 https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f441/f5f46f5e85db3ca488c37b f0f2dc70d5b2ef.pdf

25. Aj Garchitorena, "Pop Culture and the Rise of Social Media in the Philippines: An Overview," http://werdsmith.com/p/ ARutG2rFJ

26. Michael Hauben, "Preface: What is a Netizen?," in *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, p. xi http://www.columbia.edu/~rh120/ch106.txt

27. Simon Butler, "Michael F. Hauben," Columbia 250, C250 Celebrates Your Columbians, 2009 http://c250.columbia.edu/c250_celebrates/your_columbians/michael_hauben.html

28. Andrew Orlowski, "Michael Hauben, Netizen, Dies: Our Tribute," *The Register* (U.K.), June 30, 2001 https://www.theregister.co.uk/2001/06/30/michael_hauben_netizen_dies//

29. Horvath, John (July 27, 2001). "Death of a Netizen", Heise. Retrieved June 6, 2015.

30. Shirley A. Fedorak, *Anthropology Matters*, Second Edition, University of Toronto Press, 2012, p. 120 https://books .google.com/books?id=X5JeG0ZaqBQC&pg=PA120

External Links

Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet
Table of Contents (online edition)
Michael Hauben Collected Works
The Netizens Cyberstop (Hauben's original home page)
Ever Expanding Web Music Listing! (1991-2001)
C250 Celebrates Your Columbians: Michael Hauben
Internet Pioneer
A Memory of Michael Hauben, the Inventor of NETIZEN
Memorial Page
J.C.R. Licklider And The Universal Network

[Editor's Note: The following is a slightly revised version of a presentation made to a Social Movements class at Barnard College in Nov. 2017.]

Netizens and the Vision for the Future of the Net A Special Moment and Netizens in Candlelight 2008

by Ronda Hauben

Part I – Context

First I want to offer a context for the origins and importance of "The Net and Netizens; the Impact of the Net Has on People's Lives," an article that became the basis for Chapter 1 of the book *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. Then I will take a brief look at netizen activity in the 2008 Candlelight demonstrations in South Korea.

The article and the chapter are a collection of some of the experiences made possible by the Internet in what might be called the Dawn of the Internet's development. The author of the article, Michael Hauben is also the co-author with me of the book. I will refer to this book as the Netizens book in this talk. The book was first put online Jan 12, 1994 and then published in a print edition in May 1997.

In 1992-1993 Michael was an undergraduate student at Columbia University and at the time he was interested in studying communication and the potential impact of the Internet. In 1992, he enrolled in a course in ethics and computer science. The professor wanted students to do a project, which was not based on information from books.

The obvious possibility for Michael was to go online and try to gather material about a question he was deeply interested in, which was the impact that the Internet would have on society.

The Internet had been in the process of development for 20 years by this time. But it was only in 1992-1993 that it was becoming accessible to the public and connections were becoming available to people and institutions around the world.

So this was, one can say, a special moment when Michael was able to be online at Columbia University and able to do research for his class using the Internet.

There is another aspect of this moment that is important to recognize. The research process creating the Internet was in general a public process. Public funds were used and during this period it was available free to those with an educational purpose. Commercial entities, during this period were restricted in what they could do online. Michael's use of the Internet fell within its education scope. In general those online did not pay time or access charges for the time they were online. At the time, there were also commercial networks like Compuserve where one did pay time charges for being online. But also the U.S. government was claiming that in the next few years it would make the Internet commercial and turn it over to private corporations.

In planning his project, Michael formulated a few questions and sent them out online, via some different networks that were available and on mailing lists he had access to. In the appendix to the book version of Chapter I, there are copies of some of the questions Michael posted online for his research.

Fairly quickly, he received a number of substantial email responses to his questions. He gathered these, studied the content and then wrote the article he called "The Net and Netizens: the Impact the Net has on People's Lives."

Essentially what the "Net and Netizens" article does is document a number of ways that the people who wrote him had found the Net to be a significant contribution to their lives.

As I remember this period, those of us who had gotten access to the Net were busy exploring what this access would make possible.

For example, an Irish expat living in the England was able to keep up with events in Ireland by reading a weekly newsletter sent out online by a man who worked for a computer company in Galway. A music fan in the U.S. was able to learn from the Internet about a Roger

Waters concert held in Berlin one week after the Berlin Wall came down and so was able to go to Berlin in time for the concert. There were four computer science researchers in different parts of the U.S. who were able to write a research paper because of the connectivity the Net made possible. There was a poem written by two people using the Net together, which one of the authors described as "a surprisingly good poem."

These are just a flavor of some of the different contributions to people's lives that the Net made possible which people online shared with Michael via email or as comments on his posts.

There are two special aspects that he included in the Net and Netizens. First is the reference to the vision for the Internet that was put forward by JCR Licklider whom Michael calls a "prophet of the net."

Licklider was a psychologist and computer scientist brought by the Department of Defense's research entity known as ARPA to be the head of its first "Information Processing Techniques Office" (IPTO). Essentially, Licklider recognized the important role that the computer could play in human communication. "When minds interact, new ideas emerge" was one of his understandings that helped to guide the research for the development of the Net. In a paper Licklider wrote with another researcher Robert Taylor in 1968, they recognized the creative role of the new forms of communication that the Net would help bring into being, and the collaborative activity that these new forms of communication made possible.

Another significant aspect of the "Net and Netizens" article is the introduction and explanation of the new identity of the Netizen that had emerged with the development of the Internet.

Remember, the article was written in 1992-1993. Yet it begins with a prediction for the future in the new century that at the time was just a few years away.

The article opens with the greeting:

Welcome to the 21st Century. You are a Netizen (a Net Citizen), and you exist as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible. You consider everyone as your compatriot. You physically

live in one country but you are in contact with much of
the world via the global computer network….

It goes on to explain that the situation being described "is only a prediction of the future, but a large part of the necessary infrastructure currently exists…." And this new infrastructure would make possible some important developments. Among these Michael proposed was that "a new world of connections would be possible, from individual to individual or from individuals to the collective mass of those on the Net. The old model of distribution of information from a central network broadcasting company was being questioned and even challenged. The top-down model of information being distributed by a few for mass consumption was no longer the only news. Now the formerly excluded sections of society would have a means to have a voice."

But for these developments to be realized, there would be the struggle to make access to the Net open and available to all.

When Michael posted his articles like the Net and Netizens, he was greeted with encouragement. And the concept of netizen spread both around the Net and then off-line. For example one of the netizens writing Michael was Philip Fleisser from Ottawa. He encouraged Michael to put together his articles in a book and to gather other articles as well which Phil tentatively titled "Readings on the Emergence of a Better World Due to the Participatory Nature of Public Computer Networks."

As the concept of netizen spread, Michael recognized that two different uses of the concept were developing. In a talk he gave at a conference in Japan, he pointed out that one use of the concept was to refer to all users as netizens. But this was not the usage that he had in mind for the concept when he introduced it. For Michael the discovery of the emergence of the netizens was based on the recognition of the empowerment that the Net made possible and the identified netizens as those who used this empowerment to contribute to the net and the larger world it was part of. Michael reserved the use of the concept of Netizens to describe such users.

In May of 1997 the Netizen book was published in a print edition in the U.S. and in October 1997 it was published in a Japanese edition. Five years ago in 2002 in South Korea some of the significant po-

tential of the netizens which Michael foresaw was demonstrated, with the candlelight demonstrations and the netizens electing the President.

Part II – South Korea and Netizens

Over the years there have been many examples of researchers referring to netizen developments in various parts of the world. Some of the most advanced examples of both the research and practice of netizens have been in South Korea.

There is a proud tradition of protest and sacrifice on the part of South Koreans to win the minimal democratic rights they have gained. Also South Korea is one of the most wired countries in the world where a larger percentage of its population, compared with many other countries, have access to high speed Internet connectivity.

My connection to South Korea began in February 2003 when I saw a headline on the front page of the *Financial Times* newspaper that the new President of South Korea had been elected by netizens. For me, of course, this was a surprising and important headline.

I began to try to learn what was happening in South Korea. I learned that many netizens in South Korea had backed Roh Moo-Hyun who was a candidate for the South Korean Presidency from outside the political mainstream. Roh Moo-Hyun won the election in the December 2002. That event and subsequent events I learned about led me to understand that already in 2003 netizens had become an important phenomenon in South Korea.

I learned, too, that the Korean word for netizen is 네티즌, the same as the English word, though spoken with a Korean pronunciation "netijeun."

I was also encouraged to see that our book was known in South Korea, and that over the years, several commentators and scholars in South Korea have written about the importance of the concept of netizens.

Part III – 2008 Candlelight Demonstrations

By the 2007 South Korean presidential election, however, a law came into effect which penalized with fines or even jail time netizens

who tried to post online about the election. And the posts were removed. That censorship contributed to the conservative candidate Lee Myung-bak being elected with the lowest percentage of the population voting in the election. Then in April 2008, the newly inaugurated president Lee Myung-bak met with the U.S. President George W Bush. On April 18 President Lee signed an agreement to end the former restrictions on the import of U.S. beef into South Korea.

The new beef import agreement provided that beef of any cut, any age and with bone in, could be imported into South Korea from the U.S. This was a striking departure from the previous beef agreements which since 2003 had required U.S. imports to meet requirements designed to protect the South Korean public against exposure to the human version of Mad Cow Disease.

On April 29, a South Korean TV station aired a documentary exposing the poor U.S. safety practices in inspecting U.S. beef for Mad Cow Disease. Following the program there was increased online discussion about the problem of importing U.S. beef given the minimal U.S. government inspection of this beef. In response to a lot of online discussion about the beef deal, a candlelight demonstration was called for May 2, 2008 by middle-school girls and high-school students using their cell phones and a fan website among other online sites. The efforts of some of the members of one online group called "Soul Dressers" helped organize toward the May 2 demonstration. Over 10,000 people are reported to have come to the demonstration. When that large turnout appeared at the demonstration, many were surprised and it was decided to continue the next day.[1]

Then for more than 100 nights candlelight demonstrations were held in South Korea protesting the Lee Myung-bak actions and asking for regulations against the import of what much of the South Korean public deemed potentially unhealthy beef imports from the U.S.

These demonstrations were nonviolent evening vigils with candles. People of all ages and all walks of life took part, from students to families, to older people.

Though called to protest the U.S.-South Korean beef agreement, the underlying demand of the demonstrators was that the program of Lee and his conservative party not be allowed to take South Korea back

to the days of autocratic rule. There was also a call for Lee Myung-bak's impeachment.

People participated both online and in person at the demonstrations. Among the participants were "members of a cooking club, a classical music society, a fashion club, a U.S. major league baseball watching club," and other similar groups on the Internet. "Some of them joined the protests with their flags, distributed snacks and water to fellow protesters and started fund-raising for paid advertisements in daily newspapers." One researcher who described these various participants and their activities noted that such online clubs and groups had not previously engaged in politics. But remarks made by some in the group led others to join the online discussion and participate in trying to get a harmful government policy changed.

Part IV – Closing Observation

In the Net and Netizens, Michael writes, "The Net introduces the basic idea of democracy as the grassroots people power of the Netizens." One report by the international TV channel France 24, agreeing with Michael, describes what happened:[2]

In South Korea a new form of democratic expression has emerged via the Internet. Its followers call themselves Netizens and when demonstrating against the government they carry their laptops to broadcast the event live....

One researcher, Min Kyung Bae poses the problem as the contrast between "Analog Government, Digital Citizens."[3] He documents how the South Korean government continues to follow old, outmoded ways from pre-digital days. While the netizens, the digital citizens, are acting in line with the new capabilities and advances of the times. Min argues that, "The gap between Lee's 1980's style analog government and the digital citizens of 2008 is huge." He gives as one example that the "Lee administration was more interested in knowing who paid for the candles than in understanding why people were holding them." Min explains that when Lee Myung-bak closed off the Plaza to the public, the netizens took on to create an online public square and from that online commons to move the public back onto the off-line public square.

Min ends his article with the call, "Analog politicians must realize that the Internet offers an opportunity for a breakthrough to improve Korea's stagnant political culture. The candles lighting up Gwanghwamun Plaza are carrying the demand that representative democracy evolve into a new form suitable to the Internet age."

Notes:

1. A 42 minute film, "Shall We Protest?" is online which documents how the 2008 candlelight demonstrations in South Korea were initiated by high school students. It can be viewed at: http://www.engagemedia.org/Members/shallweprotest/videos/ShallWeProtest1.3en.ogv/

2. Nathalie Touret, "South Korean 'Netizens' Take to the Streets," France 24 International News, June 18, 2008.

3. Kyung Bae Min, "Analog Government, Digital Citizens," *Global Asia*, Vol. 3 No. 3; Sept. 2008, pp. 94-103. Online at: http://www.globalasia.org/v3no3/feature/analog-government-digital-citizens_kyung-bae-min

Editor's Note: The following is an expanded and updated version of a paper prepared for the IFIP-WG 9.2/9.5 Working Conference on Culture and Democracy Revisited in the Global Information Society, May 8-10, 1997, Corfu (Greece). A version appears as Chapter 17, in *An Ethical Global Information Society: Culture and Democracy Revisited*, Jacques Berleur and Diane Whitehouse, Editors, IFIP, 1997, pp. 197-202.]

Culture and Communication: The Impact of the Internet on the Emerging Global Culture

by Michael Hauben

Any document that attempts to cover an emerging culture is doomed to be incomplete. Even more so if the culture has no overt identity (at least none outside virtual

space). But the other side of that coin presents us with the opportunity to document the ebb and flow, the moments of growth and defeat, the development of this young culture. (John Frost, *Cyberpoet's Guide to Virtual Culture*, 1993)

Abstract

As we approached the new millennium, social relationships were changing radically. Even in 1969, the anthropologist Margaret Mead wrote of an "approaching worldwide culture." While she wrote of a global culture made possible by the electronic and transportation advances of her day, her words actually foresaw fundamental changes that have been substantially enhanced by the computer communication networks that were just beginning. A new culture is being formed out of a universal desire for communication. This culture is partly formed and formulated by new technology and by social desires. People are dissatisfied with their conditions, whether traditional or modern. Much of the new communication technology facilitates new global connections. This article will explore the emerging culture and the influence of the net on this new participatory global culture.

I – The Emerging Globalization of Everyday Life

The concept of a global culture arises from the extensive development of transportation and communication technologies in the twentieth century. These developments have linked the world together in ways which make it relatively simple to travel or communicate with peoples and cultures around the world. The daily exposure of the world's peoples to various cultures makes it impossible for almost any individual to envision the world consisting of only his or her culture (Mead, 1978, p. 69). We really are moving into a new global age which affects most aspects of human life. For example, world trade has become extensive, more and more words are shared across languages, people are aware of political situations around the world and how these situations affect their own, and sports and entertainment are viewed simultaneously by global audiences. The exposure to media and forms of communication helps spread many of these cultural elements. While television and radio connect people with the rest of the world in a rather removed and often passive fashion, computer networks are increasingly bringing people of various cultures together in a much more intimate

and grassroots manner. A global culture is developing, and the Internet is strongly contributing to its development.

Culture is a difficult concept to define. Tim North has gathered six different definitions in his unpublished master's thesis (1994, chapter 4.2.1):

1. Culture: The shared behavior learned by members of a society, the way of life of a group of people (Barnouw, 1987, p. 423).

2. A culture is the way of life of a group of people, the complex of shared concepts and patterns of learned behavior that are handed down from one generation to the next through the means of language and imitation (Barnouw, 1987, p. 4).

3. Culture: The set of learned behaviours, beliefs, attitudes and ideals that are characteristic of a particular society or population (Ember and Ember, 1990, p. 357).

4. Culture … taken in its wide ethnographic sense is that complex whole that includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of a society (Tyler, 1871; cited in Harris 1988, p. 122).

5. Culture: The customary manner in which human groups learn to organize their behavior in relation to their environment (Howard, 1989, p. 452).

6. Culture (general): The learned and shared kinds of behavior that make up the major instrument of human adaption. Culture (particular): The way of life characteristic of a particular human society (Nanda, 1991, p. G-3).

One common category in some of these definitions is the passing of previously learned behavior from one generation to the next. Another common category in North's definitions of culture is the importance of experience and patterns of behavior being shared among a group of people.

Historically, during most periods, culture has changed slowly and has been passed on from generation to generation. In the last half of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, for most peoples the normal rate of cultural evolution has been accelerating. Mead (1978, p. 64) writes that while in the past, culture was transmitted from the older generation to the younger with slow change

from generation to generation, today the younger generation learn from both their elders and their peers. The learning from peers is then shared with their elders. Human culture gets set by how people live their lives (Graham, 1995). Culture is created and re-enforced through how that person lives in context of society and social movements. One is taught the culture of his or her society while growing up, but those perceptions change as he or she matures, develops and lives an adult life. Culture is not statically defined. Rather, a person grows up into a culture and then can contribute to its change as time progresses. (Mead, 1956)

People are increasingly living a more global lifestyle, whether mediated through television, radio and newspapers, travel or actual experience. This global experience is facilitated by the ability of the individual to interact with people from other cultures and countries on a personal level. Images and thoughts available via mass media show that other cultures exist. But when people from different cultures actually get a chance to talk and interact, then the differences become less of an oddity and more of an opportunity (Uncapher, 1992). Professor Dennis Sumara argues that the formation of self-identity is influenced by relations with others. He writes:

> The sense of self-identity … emerges … from our symbiotic relations with others. In coming to know others we learn about ourselves. It is important to note, however, that it is not a static or unified self that we come to know, for in the coming-to-know – we are changed. We evolve through our relations with others …. (Sumara, 1996, p. 56)

That implies that people and cultures change from the interaction with other people's cultures. This new interaction and subsequent change is part of the formation of a global culture.

There are critics (Appadurai, 1990, etc.) who claim this global culture, or mass culture is snuffing out individual differences for a pre-packaged commercial culture. These critics call for the isolation of communities from each other so that uniqueness can be preserved. This criticism misses that human culture is a dynamic element of society, and freezing it would produce a museum of human society. Uncapher (1992) correctly points out that what these critics do not recognize is

that more and more people of various cultures are understanding the power of the new communication technologies. More and more people are reacting against the mass media and corporate dominance and calling for a chance to express their views and contribute their culture into the global culture. As an example, Margaret Mead tells a story (1978, pp. 5-6) of returning to a village in New Guinea which she had visited three decades earlier. She wrote(p. 5):

> In the 1930s, when one arrived in a New Guinea village, the first requests were for medicine … and for trade goods. The European was expected to bring material objects from the outside world …. But in 1967 the first conversation went:
> "Have you got a tape recorder?"
> "Yes, why?"
> "We have heard other people's singing on the radio and we want other people to hear ours."

The presence of radios made the villagers aware of the music of others, and they wanted a part of their culture broadcast around the world.

Mead understood the importance of diversity to the survival and strength of a species, whether human or animal. However, she also understood that part of the global commonality was through the spread of scientific understandings and technological developments. The desire for technology is strong among those who have only heard about its advantages. She wrote, "People who have only seen airplanes in the sky and heard the wonderful ways of radio, satellites, telescopes, microscopes, engines, and script are eager to experience these things for themselves." (Mead, 1978, p. 121) The Internet is one of the new technological advances of today, and can be seen to fit with the above examples. It is important to understand that coupled with the desire for the technological advances is the understanding of the need to control the introduction of such technology and participate to have its use benefit the particular peoples in their particular needs. The peoples of the world understand that with the implementation of technology comes a responsibility for the management and careful handling of that technology. Mead writes about this (1978, pp. 153-154):

… the very burgeoning of science that has resulted in world-wide diffusion of a monotonous modern culture has also stimulated people throughout the world to demand participation. And through this demand for participation in the benefits of a monotonous, homogeneous technology, we have actually generated new ways to preserve diversity.

Even in the primitive communities that Mead studied in the Pacific Islands, she recorded that these people adopted democracy and the use of technology with their own variations and new aspects that served their own needs. The new advances in communication technologies facilitate new democratic processes. People are discovering new ways to participate and add their cultural contributions to a larger world. Efforts to communicate via technology require the acceptance of technological standards and the building of a common technical framework. The growth of communications networks and standards at the same time allows diverse cultures to share and spread their varying cultures with others.

II – Global Contact over Computer Networks

The new media of forums, newsgroups, email, chat rooms, blogs and webpages on the internet facilitate the growth of global interactive communities. These electronic communication forms are made available through community networks, universities, the workplace, portals and internet service providers (Hauben & Hauben, 1997, p. 8). Human culture is ever evolving and developing, and the new public commons that these technologies make possible is of a global nature. A growing number of people are coming together online and living more time of their daily lives with people from around the world. Through the sharing of these moments by people, their cultures are coming to encompass more of the world not before immediately available. Mead (1978, p. 88) understood that a global community and awareness would require the development of a new kind of communication that depended on the participation of those who previously had no access to such power or such a voice.

Newsgroups and forums are a relatively young medium of human discourse and communication. The Usenet technology, one of the first broad newsgroup networks, was developed by graduate students in the late 1970s as a way to promote the sharing of information and to spread communication between university campuses. Their design highlighted the importance of the contribution by individuals to the community. The content of Usenet was produced by members of the community for the whole of the community. Active participation was required for Usenet to have anything available on it. It was the opposite of a for-pay service that provides content and information. On Usenet, the users produced the content, i.e., talk, debate, discussion, flames, reportage, nonsense, and scientific breakthroughs filled the space. Usenet was a public communications technology framework which was open. The users participated in determining what newsgroups were created, and then filled those newsgroups with messages that were the content of Usenet. In forming this public space, or commons, people were encouraged to share their views, thoughts, and questions with others (Hauben & Hauben, 1997, p. 4). The chance to contribute and interact with other people spread Usenet to become a truly global community of people hooking their computers together to communicate. People both desire to talk and to communicate with other people (Graham, 1995; Woodbury, 1994). Usenet was created to make that communication happen. In time it also gave a public voice to those who would not have had the opportunity otherwise to have their voice heard. By promoting a democratic medium, these graduate students who created Usenet were helping to create the kind of medium Mead believed was an important condition toward the development of a global culture.

In a study about the global online culture, Tim North (1994, chapter 5.2) asked the question "is there an on-line culture and society on Usenet?" His conclusion was that there was a definite Usenet culture. He listed four of the important defining aspects of this unique online culture:

1. The conventions of the culture are freely discussed.
2. The culture is not closed to outsiders and welcomes new members.
3. There is a strong sense of community within the Net culture.

4. It's what you say, not who you are.

North described the Usenet culture as open and welcoming of newcomers even if there was an occasional unfriendliness to "newbies." He focused on how the online culture was documented and available so newcomers could figure out how the community functioned and more easily join it. But also not only was the documentation available online to learn from, it was open for discussion.

Another researcher in the 1990s, Bruce Jones described the fullness of net culture:

> … the Usenet network of computers and users constitutes a community and a culture, bounded by its own set of norms and conventions, marked by its own linguistic jargon and sense of humor and accumulating its own folklore. (1991, p. 2)

Jones elaborates on what he saw to be an egalitarian tendency or tendency to contribute to the community's benefit. Jones wrote:

> … the people of the net owe something to each other. While not bound by formal, written agreements, people nevertheless are required by convention to observe certain amenities because they serve the greater common interest of the net. These aspects of voluntary association are the elements of culture and community that bind the people of Usenet together. (p. 4)

While North proposed that Usenet was a distinct culture, he argued that it could not be considered a separate society. Rather, Usenet was "a superstructural society that spans many mainstream societies and is dependent upon them for its continued existence." (1994, chap. 4.2.2)

North argued that the Net does not need to provide the physical needs made possible by a society. He wrote:

> In this superstructural view, the Net is freed of the responsibilities of providing certain of the features provided by other societies (e.g., reproduction, food and shelter) by virtue of the fact that its members are also members of traditional mainstream societies that do supply them. (1994, chap. 4.2.2)

Rather, those who use the Net live in their daily off-line society, and come to the Net for reasons other than physical needs. Others (Avis, 1995; Graham, 1995; Jones, 1991) also studied this new online culture and its connection to the growing global culture. They saw there are a distinct online culture and a distinct off-line global culture. While the online culture strongly contributes to the developing global culture off-line, it is not the sole contributing factor. The contribution of the online culture to the global culture through such technologies as forums and electronic mailing lists is important as the online media requires participation of the users to exist. Since as media forums, newsgroups and social websites encourage participation, they support the contributions of many diverse people and cultures to the broader global culture.

Both the technological design of opening one's computer up to accept contributions of others and the desire to communicate led to the creation of an egalitarian culture (Jones, 1991; North, 1994; Woodbury, 1994). People have both a chance to introduce and share their own culture and a chance to broaden themselves through exposures to various other cultures. As such, the online culture is an example of a global culture which is not a reflection of purely one culture. Instead, it both incorporates cultural elements from many nations and builds a new culture (North, 1994). Self-identity evolves through relations with others. (Sumara, 1996, p. 56) The new connections between people of different cultures allows each culture to broaden itself based on the new understandings available from other places; culture changes through the exchange with new ways of understanding and life. And this change and shared changes gets shared around the world.

III – Community Networks making Online Access Available

Being a relatively young medium, the Net is available to a subset of the world. However, this is rapidly changing. Projects are extending the connections to undeveloped countries and the basic technology needed to gain access is as simple as a computer and modem connected to the local telephone or amateur radio network. More and more people around the world are getting online via mobile devices. Another hurdle to overcome is technical training. However, the democratic ethos of the Net spreads through the help that users offer each other online. A large

number of people who are on the Net want more people to be able to use computer technology. Many are helpful and take the time and effort to spread their knowledge to others who desire to learn. Similarly everyone online at one point was new and learning. This experience of 'newbie'-ness provides a common heritage to unite people. The problems encountered in implementing and using new technology encourages people to connect to others using the technology. This is an incentive to hook into the internet where such people can be contacted. The commonality of people participating in the same technology creates a basis to develop commonality toward other interests.

Community networks in the 1990s provided a way for citizens of a locality to hook into these global communities for little or no cost (Graham, 1995). Community networks also provided a way for communities to truly represent themselves to others connected online. (Graham, 1995; Weston, 1994) Without access made available through community networks, through publicly available computer terminals or local dial-in phone numbers, only those who could have afforded the cost of a computer and the monthly charges of commercial internet service providers (ISPs) or online services or who had access through work or school would represent themselves. (Avis, 1995) Particular portraits of various cultures would thus be only partially represented. Also, when access is available and open to all, a greater wealth of contributions can be made. For example, there was a strong push in Canada and Canadian communities to get online. A lot of grassroots community network building took place. A Canadian national organization, Telecommunities Canada, stressed the importance of contributing Canada's various cultures to the online community and in this way made a contribution to the whole community. (Graham, 1995; Weston, 1994) In a similar way, Izumi Aizu (1995, p. 6) says that Japan had "an opportunity to bring its own cultural value to the open world." He continues, "It also opens the possibility of changing Japan into a less rigid, more decentralized society, following the network paradigm exercised by the distributed nature of the Internet itself." (Aizu, 1995, p. 6)

There is something to be said about the attraction of representing one's self to the greater community. The many-to-many form of communication where an individual can broadcast to the community

and get responses back from other individuals is an empowering experience. No longer do you have to be rich and powerful to communicate broadly to others and to represent yourself and your own views. This power is making it possible for individuals to communicate with others of similar and differing interests around the world. Grass-roots organization is boosted and even the formation of local community groups is all accelerated. Development of the commons to the exclusion of the big media representations makes this an electronic grass-roots medium, or a new enlarged public commons. (Felsenstein, 1993)

The online culture is primarily a written one, although much of the text is written generally in an informal, almost off-the-cuff fashion. While people will post papers and well thought out ideas, much of the conversation is generated in an immediate response to others' messages. This text can feel like a conversation, or a written version of oral culture. Stories akin to the great stories of the pre-history come about. Legends and urban myths circulate and are disseminated. (Jones, 1991) Pictures and other non-text items can be posted or sent in messages, but these non-text items are primarily transferred and not modified, thought upon or communally worked on as are the textual ideas. Graphics and graphical communication and collaboration occur more on websites, although they are still a less effective communication medium. The common shared online language was in the beginning English. (Aizu) That is changing. Other languages exist in country hierarchies and newsgroups and in mailing lists, along with chat rooms, search engines and web pages. Moreover, all these developments, textual or graphic, make possible a global conversation of diverse views. Mead recognizes that "True communication is a dialogue." (Mead, 1978, p. 77) She points out that real communication occurs "… in a world in which conflicting points of view, rather than orthodoxies, are prevalent and accessible." (Mead, 1978, p. 80)

IV – Conclusion

The new global culture is forming in several ways, none of which is a generic corporate rubber stamp. People are taking charge. They are bringing their own cultures into the global culture and spreading this new culture around the world. This is taking on a general form

and an online form. The online form provides a strong means by which people can spread their ideas and culture which in turn affects the broader global culture. This broader global culture also has an effect on newsgroups or online media. The ability to express oneself to the rest of the world is addictive and the rapid increase of new people joining the online global community makes that manifest. "The voiceless and the oppressed in every part of the world have begun to demand more power …. The secure belief that those who knew had authority over those who did not has been shaken." (Mead, 1978, p. 5) Mead states later, "There are new technological conditions within which a new initiative for the human race is possible. But it will not be found without a vision." To the former call for brotherhood and sisterhood or of loyalty to kin and one's ancestors, Mead proposes, "we can now add a vision of a planetary community." She explains that "Within such a vision, the contributions of each culture … can become complementary." However, Mead emphasizes, "but within the new vision there must be no outsiders." (pp. 147-148)

References

Aizu, Izumi. (1995). "Cultural Impact on Network Evolution in Japan Emergence of Netizens." Institute for HyperNetwork Society. Center for Global Communications (GLOCOM). International University of Japan. Available: http://www.nira.or.jp/past/publ/review/95autu mn/aizu.html

Appadurai, Arjun. (1990). "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." Public Culture. 2, pp. 1–24.

Avis, Andrew. (1995) *Public Spaces on the Information Highway: The Role of Community Networks*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Calgary. Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Barnouw, V. (1987). *An introduction to Anthropology: Ethnology.* 5th Ed. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.

Ember, C. R. & M. Ember. (1990). *Cultural Anthropology*. 6th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Felsenstein, Lee. (1993, May). "The Commons of Information." *Dr. Dobbs' Journal.* pp. 18–22.

Frost, John. (1993). *Cyberpoet's Guide to Virtual Culture.* Available: http://www.reststop.net/cybercomm/cgvc 1.html

Graham, Garth. (March 29, 1995). *A Domain Where Thought is Free to Roam: The Social Purpose of Community Networks*. Prepared for Telecommunities Can-

ada for CRTC Public Hearings on Information Highway. Available: http://www.ncf.ca/ncf/freeport2html/conferences/access95/reading/crtc_bri.txt.html

Harris, M. (1988). *Culture, People, Nature: An introduction to General Anthropology*. 5th Ed. New York: Harper and Row.

Hauben, Michael and Ronda Hauben. (1997). *Netizens: On The History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. Los Alamitos, CA. IEEE Computer Society Press. Also available (1994): http://www.columbia.edu/ ~hauben/netbook/

Howard, M.C. (1989). *Contemporary Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd Ed. Glenview, Il: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Jones, Bruce. (1991). *An Ethnography of the Usenet Computer Network: Proposal for a Ph.D. Dissertation in Communications*. University of California, San Diego. Dept. of   Communication.

Mead, Margaret. (1956). *New Lives For Old: Cultural Transformations - Manus, 1928-1953*. New York: William Morrow & Company.

Mead, Margaret. (1978). *Culture and Commitment: The New Relationships Between the Generations in the 1970s*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.

Nanda, S. (1991). *Cultural Anthropology*. 4th Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

North, Tim. (1994) *The Internet and Usenet Global Computer Networks: An Investigation of Their Culture and its Effects on New Users*. Unpublished master's thesis. Curtin University of Technology. Perth, Australia.

Sumara, Dennis J. (1996). "Private readings in public: Schooling the literary imagination." In *Studies in the Postmodern Theory of Education. Counterpoint*. Vol. 26 (Joe L. Kincheloe and Shirley R. Steinberg General Editors). New York: Peter Lang.

Uncapher, Willard. (1992) *Between Local and Global: Placing the Mediascape in the Transnational Cultural Flow.* Available: http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/courses/encr481/Uncapher.doc

Weston, Jay. (Nov. 26, 1994). *Old Freedoms and New Technologies: The Evolution of Community Networking*. Paper presented at the Free Speech and Privacy in the Information Age Symposium: The University of Waterloo, Canada. Published in *The Information Society: An International Journal*, Vol. 13, Issue 2, 1997. Available: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/019722497129214?queryID=%24{resultBean.queryID}#preview. Access restricted.

Woodbury, Gregory G. (1994, Fall). "Net Cultural Assumptions." *Amateur Computerist* Newsletter. Vol. 6 No. 2-3. Available: http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/ACN6-2-3. pdf

The Netizen as the Emerging New Form of Citizenship

by Ronda Hauben

I am happy to be here today to make a contribution about the nature and importance of netizens.

In my talk I want to focus on this significant phenomenon that has emerged along with the Internet's development. That is the Netizens.

First I want to give an example.

Recently Facebook users in Turkey have been finding ways to enhance Turkish-Greek friendship. They post about similarities in Greek and Turkish culture with the mission of diminishing the historic hostility that is common between the two peoples.

In a study,[1] Turkish researchers sought to determine if these on-line friendship groups between the two peoples help to build friendly feelings on a cultural basis. The study stresses that the effort is to discuss subjects like foods the two groups eat that are similar, pictures of holidays each group celebrates, and music video clips by each of the two groups. Such postings are intended to convey the common idea that people of both groups are "ordinary people with common world views."

This study refers to the definition of the word netizen provided by Michael Hauben in the book *Netizens: on the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*.[2]

A Netizen (net citizen) exists "as a citizen of the world thanks to the global connectivity that the Net makes possible. You consider everyone as your compatriot. You physically live in one country but you are in contact with much of the world via the global computer network. Virtually you live next door to every other single Netizen in the world…. A new more democratic world is becoming possible … that allows excluded sections of society to have a voice."

Such activity on the part of netizens of different nations is intended to create a peace communications channel for building peaceful feelings between different peoples via the netizen contributions to the Internet.

This is an example of online activity that is consistent with the definition of netizen acting as a citizen of the Net, as a net citizen.

The concept of the citizen of the net was part of the original definition of the word netizen. But the word has also come to be used as describing all users online. Netizens in the original definition describes those who actively contribute to the development and defense of the Internet as a global communications platform. It describes those who come online for public rather than simply for personal and entertainment purposes.

Why is this distinction important?

There is universal appreciation that the Internet is a major advance in human communication. But it is less well understood that the Internet brings to ordinary people an empowerment, a greater chance to have a fuller spectrum of information and opinion and a chance to participate and get feedback.

Feeling that empowerment, some people online, not all people but some, adopt public purposes. They become citizens of the net. This is an ongoing process. Having online search engines, a wide variety of information repositories, and different sources of news and eye witness reports, make people better informed. Plus the possible contact with other people not restricted by location, is a force to increase people's confidence and ability to make a contribution toward the solution of the problems of their society, and in so doing they help to build a more peaceful world in the process.

Thank you for your attention.

Notes

1. Burak Gümüş, A Baran Dural, Mustafa Selcuk, "Kalimerhaba: Turkish-Greek Facebook Communities," *Atlasjournal of Social Sciences*, 2018. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/37946632/ Kalimerhaba_Turkish-Greek_Facebook_Communities

2. Michael Hauben, Ronda Hauben, *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, IEEE Computer Society Press, 1997.

[Editor's Note: Ronda and Jay Hauben attended the 6th World Internet Conference (WIC) in Wuzhen, Zhejian Province, China, Oct 20-22, 2019. Following is a summary of what they experienced at that conference.]

Our Experiences at the 2019 World Internet Conference

by Jay Hauben

The theme of the 6th World Internet Conference was to "Jointly Build a Community with a Shared Future in Cyberspace." The organizers reported that there were around 1500 attendees from 83 countries. The Conference consisted of an opening ceremony, 20 sub forums and a major exhibit of Internet related technologies. There was much talk about the expected new scientific and industrial revolution coming from the combination of 5G network technology, AI (Artificial Intelligence), block chain, Big Data, and Internet of Things (IoT). Especially, AI was seen as having great potential but also great risk. A question debated at one of the sub forums was how to build structural precautions against the risks of AI. To me that is the most pressing task concerning AI.

In the opening ceremony, a congratulatory message was read from Xi Jinping, President of China. The keynote speakers emphasized the points made in this message and in President Xi's speech at the 2nd WIC in Wuzhen in 2015. Included in that speech and repeated in the opening ceremony was the principle, Promotion of Openness and Cooperation. In 2015 President Xi said, "All countries should advance opening-up and cooperation in cyberspace and further substantiate and enhance the opening-up efforts." One of the keynote speakers saw this openness and cooperation as the way to build a community with a shared future in cyberspace, the theme of the conference. It seemed the

openness discussed was aimed at countries and each other's IT industry not the users. To me however it should be taken as an encouragement for the Internet to be open for a broad set of voices and opinions. It was also mentioned in the keynote speeches that the Internet helps cultures to blend and guides users to a higher level of people to people friendship. Seeking such people to people friendship is one strong motivation for our visits to China.

In the plenary session that followed the opening ceremony, Stephen Wolff give a brief history of the Internet. Wolff had been, from 1986 to 1994, the Division Director at the U.S. National Science Foundation responsible for managing the NSFNET project which became the backbone of the Internet in the U.S. Most Internet traffic at that time passed over the NSFNET. Wolff too emphasized that pioneers of the Internet intended openness and universal connectivity. He gave credit to Chinese Academician Hu Qiheng for championing China's connectivity to the Internet in 1994. Madam Hu tells the story that she was prepared for formal U.S./ China negotiations to arrange China's connection to the Internet. She visited the U.S. in April 1994 with that intention. But she says, at the appointment she had with Wolff, he told her that there is no problem. In the next few days she heard from her colleagues in Beijing that the connection has been made, no negotiations, no treaty. Mme Hu was part of the international collaboration that made the Internet and the spread of the Internet possible. Also, it was often mentioned at this conference that 2019 was the 25th Anniversary of China's 1994 connection to the Internet. 2019 is also the 50th Anniversary of the ARPANET, forerunner of the Internet. Those anniversaries gave extra importance to this year's World Internet Conference.

Ronda made a presentation in the Cyberculture and Youth sub forum[1] hosted by the Central Committee of the Communist Youth League and the All-China Youth Federation. It was co-organized by the China Federation of Internet Societies, China Youth New Media Association and NetEase, Inc. Besides the keynote speakers, there were 18 presenters including from China, Nepal, the U.S., Japan, India, Hong Kong, and Mexico each with a limit of six minutes for their talks.

The sub forum organizers defined cyberculture as "the compound of new technologies and cultural content as well as the collection

of cultural activities, forms, products and ideas in cyberspace." And that, "as 'digital natives,' young people are being profoundly influenced by the Internet." But, besides being a platform for cultural exchange and mutual learning, cyberspace and cyberculture are venues for youth innovation and self expression. The value to me of the sub forum was that it recognized the importance of the Internet to young people and the importance of the youth everywhere to the Internet and to their societies. The sub forum aimed to focus on cyber-cultural issues but also to "encourage young people across the globe to make their contributions to the development of cyberculture and online exchanges."

After the Opening Remarks at the sub forum, a spectrum of viewpoints was expressed in the eighteen 6-minute talks. The first presenter, Zhang Yiwu, Professor, Department of Chinese Language and Literature, Peking University described how hundreds of millions of lines of original literature have been created online by Chinese speaking netizens and spread around the world in Chinese but also in translation. The spread of this literature gives the world a chance to better know Chinese thinking and encourages young people to contribute their writing online. Some of the other speakers talked about aiming their products at online youth, such as Marvel Comics and Pokémon Games. Many saw the Internet making possible greater participation of the youth in all aspects of society. Max Trejo, Secretary-General, International Youth Organization for Ibero-America, spoke in Spanish. He saw that youngsters are creating, fully participating in the production of and accessing much of the cultural content on the net. They talk with each other directly and form a bottom-up innovation process, demonstrating that now ordinary people can have a positive impact on each other, giving them a sense of ownership of the cyber community. Ronda's presentation,[2] broadened the spectrum of the sub forum by seeing youth and others as not only users but some as citizens of the Internet and of the world. She told the story of Facebook users in Turkey finding ways to enhance Turkish-Greek friendship with the mission of diminishing the historic hostility that is common between the two peoples. She argued that such activity on the part of netizens of different nations is intended to create a peace communications channel for building peaceful feelings between different peoples via the netizen contributions to the

Internet. The net empowers some people including young people to adopt a public purpose. They become netizens, citizens of the net.

Mirroring the Internet, a strong purpose of the whole World Internet Conference and especially of the Cyberculture and Youth sub forum was the encouragement and deepening of international exchanges toward "Jointly Building a Community with a Shared Future in Cyberspace."

True to this purpose, it was wonderful for Ronda and me to meet people at the conference from around the world as well as to make new friends in China. We had great fun with and much help from the English speaking volunteer guides from Zhejian and Shanghai universities. Not only were they helpful to non-Chinese speaking attendees like us, the guides had the valuable experience of interacting with people from all over the world and using and improving their foreign language skills. The Shanghai International Studies University (SISU) students and staff we met were serious, friendly and hard working. We appreciated the special care they took of us.

Our biggest surprise and treasure was to see and say hello to internet pioneers, some of whom we have met and collaborated with over the last 25 years. They were from Japan (Jun Mauri and Izumi Aizu), Korea (Kilnam Chon), Germany (Werner Zorn), France (Louis Pouzin) and the U.S. (Stephen Wolff and Dave Farber). Mme Hu Qiheng from China did not attend this conference but was praised by Stephen Wolff as a valuable contributor to the Internet's spread to and in China. Maybe it could only be in Wuzhen that we would see them all in one place. Also, the food was fine for all our meals, maybe especially the student's lamb and noodle soup we ate in the Scholar Noodle Restaurant in the old town part of Wuzhen.

We did get lost sometime but that was minor. One evening when walking back to our hotel, some local Wuzhen adults encouraged us to join them in their nightly dance/exercises. It was a fun shared experience. We especially were happy to hear the speech by Stephen Wolff in the opening day plenary session because he summarized accurately the history that Ronda, I and our son Michael had studied and documented in the book Michael and Ronda wrote, *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet.*

Ronda was happy for the opportunity to be part of the Cyber Culture and Youth Sub Forum. She got some positive feedback after her speech about netizens as net citizens coming online for public not just personal or entertainment purposes.

We greatly appreciated this opportunity to visit China again. Besides attending the conference in Wuzhen, we had a chance to visit some dear friends in Beijing and Shanghai. I was again impressed how much Chinese people and American people have in common. Now home in NYC, I will look for ways to help increase American-Chinese people's friendship.

Notes:
1. The program of the Cyberculture and Youth sub forum was posted in English at: https://service.wicwuzhen.cn/forum/?from=singlemessage#/forum_e_manual?dataId=338751646689529856&lang=en
2. The text of Ronda's talk is online at: http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/china2019/Wuzhen-talk-2019.pdf

---

[Editor's Note: The following article appeared online at https://werdsmith.com/p/ARutG2rFJ. It was likely a paper written while the author was a masters degree student at the University of the Philippines, 2013-2018.]

Pop Culture and the Rise of Social Media in the Philippines: An Overview

by Aj Garchitorena

Abstract

It is somewhat amusing that children in their formative years use technology as though it is a basic necessity for their development. With this statement alone, it is undeniable that commercial advancement in technology and the facility of the world--wide web creates a sort of transcendence in a faster and inclusive way that is not possible in the physical world. Nevertheless, if this very modern concept, if not an advent

of a futuristic one, would be collapsed in the confines of a perspective of a still developing nation, what would be the outcome?

This study aims to look at the rise of New Media and social media in the Philippines, as well as its effect on the promotion of popular culture on the media consumers of the country. It will focus on several facets of Philippine contemporary life such as the political, economic, and social, and connect it with the cultural. By the end of this paper, there will be predictions regarding the future of the Philippine experience under these said circumstances should the current state of media in the country not change, a sort of an analysis that would allow readers to initiate their own introspection regarding media use.

Introduction

According to the Yahoo-Nielsen Survey of 2013, the top three sources of media consumption in the Philippines come from the television, the radio, and the continually rising internet usage. With these media vehicles, the so-called fourth estate of the government, one can actually deduce that watching favorite shows on the televison, listening to radio programs, or even surfing the world-wide web can have political, social, and economic implications.

This paper, thus, will look at these said implications – the three interconnected tiers of Philippine life, said above – and connect it with the popular culture in the Philippines to give an overview to the public regarding this obvious but unnoticed scene in Philippine media studies. Specifically, the objectives of this paper are:

1. to dissect the concept of popular culture in the Philippine context and locate its origin;

2. to connect popular culture to the usage of conventional media such as television and radio usage, and the rise of and social media or new media;

3. to locate interlocking concepts regarding popular culture and social media in the political, economic, and social aspects of everyday Philippine life to somewhat give an overview of the current state of Philippine media studies. One latent objective of the study, however, is to initiate introspection among the public regarding their usage or personal consumption of media in their everyday life.

To further give flesh and bone to the paper, the proponent will primarily use the literature and scholarship of the following authors:

1. Bienvenido Lumbera – for popular culture and its origin and implications

2. Michael Hauben – for the theory of the Netizen and his perspectives on the individual as a user of social media

3. Herman and Chomsky – on the political-economic implications of media

4. McCombs and Shaw – for the Agenda-Setting Theory of media and its implications

5. Graeme Turner – on the democratization of media

Although each author is quite focused on a singular topic, there are still parts of each that connect with each other, and will be part of the analysis.

The study is somewhat limited for this will only cover the said topic in a very macro level and not in a more specific and specialized way. More so, most literature except Lumbera, are from non-Filipino authors but they do address the topic in a very universal manner. The methodology is somewhat limited for it only includes pure archival research, and bias regarding the personal usage of media on the perspective of the author may also cause further limitation. More so, the media to be discussed here is the media conglomerate part of Philippine media, and not the state-owned part for the former is the more evident and profitable side, while the latter is quite ignored or neglected by the general public, and one can say, the government itself.

This study, nevertheless, sets a ground for a new frontier in Philippine studies research for thus far, social media in the Philippines, except for statistical data, seemed to be untouched. No matter how moot and futile this exercise may seem to some, the author reiterates that things included in the paper needed to be known by the public in a very word-of-mouth conversational manner, and even though everything about the topic of the paper seems obvious, it has always been unnoticed and, therefore, should be given the chance to be placed under the attention and scrutiny of the general public and not only by scholars, students, or members of the current intelligentsia.

RELATED LITERATURE

Popular Culture in the Philippines

"Building a culture has to start with a foundation, and that foundation must necessarily be the culture of the Filipino people if this could be separated with [from?] the encrustations grown on it by colonial rule."

Popular culture, according to National Artist for literature Bienvenido Lumbera in his book *Revaluation: Essays on Philippine Literature, Theater and Popular Culture* (1984), is highly different from the folk culture and nationalist culture of the Filipinos. In a nutshell, folk culture is the way of living in a place in a specific time and portrays the practices of a certain people, and on how they cope to survive with nature. Nationalist culture is the culture created through colonial resistance with the collective of people on a given place and time. These two are different from popular culture which can be traced even in the period of Hispanisation of the Philippines.

According to Lumbera, popular culture in the Philippines was created and used by the Spaniards to the native Filipinos or Indios via plays and literature to get the heart of the natives and win it. The colonial origins of popular culture found in the Philippines can be traced by looking at salient developments in Philippine literature. The first permanent Spanish settlement began replacing the native culture with a Christian and European tradition. The children of the native elite under the tutelage of missionaries became a core group of intelligentsia called 'ladinos,' as they became instrumental "in bringing into the vernacular, literary forms that were to be vehicles for the 'pacification' of the natives." Forms of popular theater and literature such as "the pasyon, sinakulo, and korido ensured the acceptance and spread of Christianity, and the komedya and awit did the same for the monarchy." Popular culture as introduced by the Spanish was "popular" to the extent that it was a "watering-down of Spanish-European culture for the purpose of winning the general populace over to the 'ideology' of the colonial regime." Popular culture at the time was created by colonial authorities, with the aid of the local intelligentsia, to promote the interests of the Church and the State.

However, once the native intelligentsia saw the effects of popular culture and knew how to work its way as propaganda, they soon

used the Spanish weapon against them. In the 19th century, through the Propaganda movement, the native intelligentsia used the same forms of popular culture to "undermine the power of the abusive friars and rally the populace to put an end to colonial rule." One example is the work of Marcelo H. del Pilar when he soon used prayers such as the 'Aba, Ginoong Maria' and 'Ama Namin' in a sort of parody to strike against the abusive Spanish Friars.

The advent of American colonialism brought, the properly so-called, popular culture to the Philippines. The liberal policy regarding the printing press, soon through radio, television and film, increased the circulation of popular culture forms. Not only through these forms but also in new media then, such as films. Hollywood films had a near-monopoly in the Philippine market especially in the absence of European movies due to World War I.

Early on, the local intelligentsia had the same apprehensions over mass media as they called it commercialization, or vulgarization of art. According to Lumbera, the local intelligentsia noticed that "Popular literature as a commodity intended for a mass market was seen to pose a threat to serious artistic work, because the writers accommodated his art to the demands of the publishers and editors who were more interested in sales rather than aesthetics." More so, "... popular culture is not created by the populace ... rather, it is culture created either by the ruling elite or by members of the intelligentsia in the employ of that elite, for the consumption of the populace."; it is "...'packaged' entertainment or art intended for the profit of rulers, be they colonial administrators or native bureaucrats and businessmen."

To see it in Lumbera's lens, "Popular culture is power, and whoever wields it to manipulate minds is likely to find it's literary and technological machinery turned against him when the minds it has manipulated discover its potency as a political weapon."

The Theory of the Netizen and Democratization of Media

The word netizen, though it has been used popularly in current times, is actually a word from the theory of Michael Hauben (1997) is a corrupted term from the phrase "Net Citizen." According to Hauben, as

netizens, geographical separation in the actual reality is replaced by existence in the same virtual space called the internet. More so, along with the power of using the internet is the power of the reporter given to the netizen for a netizen could actually be a source of primary information regarding certain topics or issues. Hauben profoundly cautions that the internet can, nevertheless, be a "source of opinion" though he said that a netizen can train him/her self to discern real from fabricated information.

This prophecy will soon be reflected in Graeme Turner's book called the *Demotic Turn* (2010) but in a certain extreme way for even news reports are often bent to suit the "infotainment" genre favored by the general audience. According to Turner, there is a rise of opinionated news as reporters tend to bend the news to the stories they often favor. A concrete example of this is tabloidization, or sensationalising small news items and making a big deal out of such.

The Agenda-Setting Theory

The Agenda-Setting theory of McCombs and Shaw (1972) can be simplified by saying that media influences people to focus its attention on something under a certain agenda. It can make people think that something is actually happening when something is not, or give special attention or focus on certain subjects or topics and hype it to make an impression that something big is going on. To give an example, the agenda-setting theory can be seen in a newspaper wherein the headline is supposed to be the biggest news there is, and the other items, decreasing in font size and the farther its location from the front page, the lesser priority it has. Similarly, in a news program, wherein the reporter or news anchor gives too much air time to a certain news, or depending on the arrangement of the news items, the more pressing issue it is. This theory can also be applied in the radio, or on new media such as the internet.

The Political-Economy of Media

According to Hermann and Chomsky's Propaganda Model (1988), a model they have used to check the various political-economic

implications of mass media, there are several filters to use in relation with the topic to check the propaganda machine of mass media.

These filters are the following:

1. The size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, profit orientation of the different mass media firms

2. Advertising as the primary income source of mass media

3. The reliance of the media on the information provided by the government, business, and these "experts" funded and approved by such sources and agents of power

Note that there are also two more filters ("Flak" as means of disciplining the media, anti-communism as a national religion and control mechanism) but that would be irrelevant with the current study.

Analysis

The proponent, especially based on the history and origin of popular culture in the Philippines, attributes the rise of popular culture to such technologies like the television, radio, and the internet, and the popularization of the said technologies because of the usage of such in the everyday culture. Nevertheless, the seemingly innocent usage or consumption of media in different ways beholds power in its interstices.

This paper, as mentioned will look at three tiers on how media spreads popular culture, and affects the aspects of Filipino life such as the political, economic, and the social.

Political-Economic Aspect

The easier to figure out among the three is the economic. According to Lumbera, popular culture in the rise of technologies like the television and the radio, soon deteriorated the notion of art and made it appear that it is consumable and a commodity. He called it, as he said, according to other artists of the time, vulgarization of art. He meant that art forms were popularized by the use of technology and were tailor-fit to exactly serve the taste of the greater audience, sacrificing its quality in the process. This phenomena or grievance, if one may call it, can also be seen in Turner's argument regarding the rise of infotainment. Infotainment is the trend of making an issue seemingly pressing enough

to give an ample or little new information, but more so, entertainment to the public.

According to the Yahoo-Nielsen 2013 Survey, infotainment is one of the most searched contents and sites most visited in the Philippines. This meant a lot of irrelevant news we see on the television or internet that can be dismissed as a fad but were given the limelight to amuse people, and people seem to buy it. Just look at websites like Yahoo, itself, for it offers a lot of interesting articles which may seem to catch the interest of the public but also to cross-promote.

Cross-promotion is a term referring to the promotion of an advertisement in a very subtle way inside another program, or the like. Aside from acknowledging that the reason why there is this so-called "vulgarization of the art" and the "rise of infotainment" to attract advertisers to advertise in commercial breaks during television or radio shows, or popping-up in the websites, cross-promotion has been a wide practice and people can actually sense it but not look it straight in the eye. Imagine watching a movie and seeing a product endorsement of the main protagonist being used in it, say coffee, and he or she prepares and drinks the coffee in one of the scenes – that is cross-promotion. The latent or subtle manifestation of endorsing products. Even in the internet, there are a lot of articles planted just to make an advertisement and these are often the infotainment ones. Even video games have cross-promoting activities, or even radio jockeys do it in a very conversational and suave manner. For lots of years, cross-promotion has been commonly practiced, but the problem does not end there.

Cross-promoting activities in various media platforms cannot always be subtle, for there many now with explicit exercise of such, and in connection with Lumbera's sacrificing the art grievance, it can already be seen that media does not proliferate art, or material with high value but sacrifices all these, even the content, form, and quality of popular culture just to use it as an advertisement as an example, a whole dialogue or story plot can be twisted, to bend, bow and scrape to the demands of the main benefactor – product endorsements.

Socio-Political Aspect

It was a common saying that whoever has command of the economic power also wields the political. In the study of pop culture and Philippine media, one can already see that the economic and political aspects were highly mutual conditions that are beneficial to each other. This statement is logical for, according to Herman and Chomsky, media really gets all the income from advertisements and whoever has the bigger sponsorship gets the media attention, or programs will be bent according to how their product endorsement vis-a-vis cross-promotion would fit.

It is important to notice, however, that media's power does not only reside on the economic, but also to the monopoly of sources, as cited also by Herman and Chomsky. There are limited sources by which media can get information, and with it, they control – government, businesses, and the like – whatever is going in and out of the information tube.

More over, one must also check the relation of media to its audience. Because of popular culture, media is actually used to create a certain agenda on its viewers, and the resulting relationship is a political one wherein the one controlling here is the media company or institution. According to McCombs and Shaw's Agenda-Setting Theory, media can make us think about something by conditioning our minds in a very latent manner, most especially through salience. It means that if ever the media company wants you to think about a political stand or buying that special perfume, they will do it in repetition and via cross-promotion using several advertising techniques. Surveys such as Nielsen give the media companies an idea what formula would work on a sellable television show, or the like. This can be equivocal with the idea that the "naked" news in several western news companies are created not because they need people to watch news, but also to make them watch and earn their share in the advertising arena. One can argue that some news articles can be imaginary or bloated to be sensationalized and news-worthy. Thus, media, through its influences, indirectly commands the people to behave the way that is favorable to them.

This argument, however, is rapidly changing through leverage, for there is a thing called media democratization and that is connected with the rise of social media.

To break the monopoly of media conglomerates on the information flow can be attributed with the democratization of media via the internet. Michael Hauben's theory of the Netizen, when he coined the term in the late 1990's imagined the world's physical limits collapsed via the faster streaming of information and communication via the internet, and true enough, the effect is limitless and transcendental – quite a benchmark of a 21st century high technology. Hauben also imagined the democratizing power of media, for everyone can voice out their ideas via the internet, but this can only be achieved if everyone in the society, even those in the margins, can be given the chance to voice out their ideas.

In the Philippines, the internet usage penetration is more than 30 percent as of 2012, and is continuously rising (Yahoo-Nielsen, 2013). According to the same survey, more Filipinos use tablets and mobile phones to access the internet, and with the rise of smart phones in the country, we can assume that the projected number can be rising exponentially. However, the democratization of media, even if away from Hauben's ideal 100% penetration in the society, is still evident in the society, and this is via social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and the like. Among the three, Facebook, is the widely-used platform (Yahoo-Nielsen, 2013).

Public opinion rises from these sites, proliferation of liberal ideas happen especially in the Philippines for the government never censors the content though there was an attempt in the Cyber-crime law. The agenda and capability seemed to prove its political worth in the Philippines last September 2013 when, as though an Arab or Persian Spring that were so-called Twitter or Facebook Revolution, through the facilitation of social media, many Filipinos all around the Philippines and the world joined a simultaneous protest they called the "Million People March" (Garchitorena, 2013).

In everyday life, one can see the leverage done by media conglomerates in the social media scene by making an account for famous reporters and television or radio channels so that they can also make

real-time broadcasting simultaneous with the real-time updates of social media information dissemination (Garchitorena, 2013). This is soon proved to be beneficial when media companies make news out of public opinion often found in tweets or posts in social media sites, as predicted earlier on through the rise of talk radios (Turner, 2010). There are even portions wherein mere viewers, through mobile devices, are made to report on a first-hand account of a storm surge or anything, and send the clip via internet instead of sending a real and trained reporter to check out the situation. This phenomena, will, nevertheless, prove to be beneficial if Hauben's theory of a democratized society, via the internet wherein all people are given access, plus the required training to voice their selves out as Netizens, would materialize.

Conclusion

To summarize the paper, popular culture was first introduced and given flesh and bone through the study of Lumbera. It will be the foundation of the media we see today, and it fleshed out reasons why media commands economic, political, and social power in the Philippines. Through several media theories, it was shown that in media's main goal via the proliferation of pop culture creates a commercialized world as it generated income through advertisements, and whoever commands economic power commands the political, as well. Media companies can also facilitate pop culture to make their audience behave the way they would be favorable to them, also because they monopolize the information stream. This can also be countered with the democratization of media through the facilitation of social networking sites and by projecting ideas as a netizen on the internet. This may cause leverage but may not completely achieve its full potential for full democratization can be done if all people in the society can gain full access with the said technology. It may also have down effects for media companies can use Netizens as primary sources of information, as though "empowering" them. This can also be countered with education if the public on how to use social media that would benefit them.

"Popular culture is power, and whoever wields it to manipulate minds is likely to find its literary and technological machinery turned

against him when the minds it has manipulated discover its potency as a political weapon." (Lumbera, 1984)

The future of social media's political, economic, and social facility as a tool, or a weapon, against media conglomerates and the advertising machinery, or the government or any institutional agenda may still be achieved if the general public, especially those in the margins who were always victimized by the false images shown through media, should discover and use its full potential.

Bibliography

Aj Garchitorena, *Picnic in the Park: The Role of Social Media as a Precursor of a Social Movement and a Facilitator in the Million People. March*, 2013.

Michael Hauben and Ronda Hauben, *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. IEEE Computer Society Press. 1997.

Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Pantheon Books. 1988.

Bienvenido Lumbera. *Revaluation: Essays on Philippine Literature, Cinema, and Popular Culture*. 1984.

Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw. "The agenda-setting function of mass media." Public Opinion Quarterly. Volume 36, Issue 2. pp. 176–187. 1972.

Graeme Turner. *Ordinary People and the Media: The Demotic Turn*. SAGE Publications. 2010.

ELECTRONIC EDITION
ACN Webpage: http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/
All issues of the *Amateur Computerist* are on-line.
All issues can be accessed from the Index at:
http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/NewIndex.pdf