

# The Amateur Computerist

<http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/>

Fall 2020

Toward a Second Netizen Book

Volume 34 No. 1

## Table of Contents

Forward .....	<a href="#">Page 1</a>
Introduction .....	<a href="#">Page 1</a>
What is a Netizen .....	<a href="#">Page 3</a>
What the Net Means to Me .....	<a href="#">Page 4</a>
Participatory Democracy From the 1960s .....	<a href="#">Page 5</a>
Culture and Communication .....	<a href="#">Page 14</a>
The Net and Netizens .....	<a href="#">Page 20</a>

## Forward

In this issue of the *Amateur Computerist*, we are publishing chapters for a new book documenting the activities and the developing vision of the netizen phenomenon. The following chapters are for a second book in a possible series of books about netizen development. The series started with the “Netizens Netbook” put online in 1994 and then by *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet the Internet*, published in 1997 in a print edition in English and a few months later in a Japanese translation. That book has inspired many netizens and netizen scholars over the years. It was the two authors’ desire to continue to document and analyze the continuing netizen developments. The second book is intended in part to recognize the development of the netizen phenomenon that has taken place since the publication of the Netizens Netbook in the 1990s. It will include some articles written by Michael Hauben after its publication. It will also include articles documenting the development of Netizens in China from 2002-2014 and the development of the Netizen phenomenon in South Korea from 2002-2017.

## Introduction

by Ronda Hauben

At the beginning of the 1990s, Michael Hauben, an early Internet scholar, made a scientific discovery when he recognized that an important advance of our times was not only the Net (i.e., the Internet), but even more importantly the rarely recognized emergence of the Netizen. The netizen is the empowered online global citizen striving to make the Net and the world it is part of a more desirable and grassroots controlled environment. The vision Michael had was the foundation of the Netizens Netbook. He was able to both articulate the vision and see the signs that the vision was becoming a reality in the actions and consciousness of netizens made possible by the Net.

The Netizens Netbook grew out of both online suggestions to Michael that he put his inspiring articles into a book and my thoughts that there was a need for a book that could look ahead in a scientific way, as the 17<sup>th</sup> Century economic writings I was reading at the time did for their times.

Based on Michael and my desire to publish such a book, I spent several months gathering different articles Michael and I had written and putting them into a set of files which we posted online in January 1994.

We announced that the book which became known as the “Netizens Netbook” would be available online to download via the protocol known as FTP (file transfer protocol). We put an announcement in a local events-of-the-week newspaper. We were able to arrange to use a room at the local community college for the event.

Just a few people came. One of those attending was a teacher I had worked with at the Ford Dearborn Engine Plant. A postman we knew from the

post office who was also a computer enthusiast attended, as did a former neighbor who was a Commodore computer user. One person came from the notice in a local events newspaper.

Michael read a selection from “The Net and the Netizen,” one of his chapters in the book.<sup>1</sup> I had planned to read something, but I did not think there was time so I didn’t present my selection. Mainly we managed to show that the book was online and was available to be downloaded via ftp. This was January 12, 1994.

It had only been by 1993 that the Internet had substantially spread, though work on it had been in process for more than 20 years by then, starting in 1973. The Netizen Netbook was a pioneering publication. Its actual title was “Netizens and the Wonderful World of the Net,” Michael made sure the book was announced online. Later the title became “Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet.” Much as Michael had envisioned, the Internet spread broadly and widely. Also what has spread is the excitement of netizens who recognize that they are empowered by the Net as those who take on to explore what this empowerment makes possible. What has been quite fascinating is to meet and talk with netizens from different places around the world and to learn of their efforts and fortitude.

Also it has been quite fascinating to have had the experience of learning about and then becoming connected with the netizens of South Korea (where the Korean word for Netizen is pronounced net-I-zen).

In South Korea, the work has been welcomed and spread and has been developed further.

When looking for the concept of netizen on the Korean search engine Naver, one colleague told me, “You are famous in Korea.” Actually it was the concept of ‘netizen’ and Michael’s work that was famous, but what a thrill it was to hear such a sweet compliment for the work.

It is in Korea that netizens played the crucial role in the election of the president of the country in 2002 and where netizens took seriously both the weaknesses and the strengths of the empowerment that the Net promised.

In China, there are hundreds of millions of netizens and their amazing activity, of which the creation of an anti-cnn web site to counter the media myths about China spread by the western media CNN and BBC, etc. is one of many such examples. Many

people in China have hope for the future. That hope, they say is based on netizens and what they do online to challenge the abuse of power.

There are other examples of important netizen achievements. For example, netizens in Egypt built a means to communicate across the divide of those with left or right political perspectives.<sup>2</sup> Based on such achievements the Egyptian people were able to bring down the Mubarak government in 2011. Indonesian netizens were able to spread their communication from online to offline so the Indonesian people could prevail against Suharto in 1998.

Over the years since the publication of *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*, Michael’s work has been quoted or referred to in many scholarly articles. The concept of the netizen has spread and been developed in significant ways. See, for example, the work of Haiqing Yu about the new form of citizenship being explored by Chinese netizens,<sup>3</sup> or the work of Mark Poster about the potential of the netizen to provide a significant challenge to the corporate dominated globalization.<sup>4</sup>

The title for this new book is: *In the Era of the Netizen: Models for Participatory Democracy*.

I am proposing that the models for the future in politics, journalism, economics, and culture will emerge from those situations where there have been participation and communication to contribute to generative developments.

The dynamic form of the Netizen Netbook has been said to be “path breaking,” “seminal,” “a milestone” or the “renowned” book. Among the descriptions for Michael’s works are, “the Original Netizen,” “scholar,” and “the first participatory historian of the Internet.” There have been other interesting observations that have grown out of the spread of both the consciousness and the actions of netizens. For example, the late Mark Poster, a noted media scholar, recognized that “the netizen might be the formative figure of a new kind of political relations, one that shares allegiance to the nation with allegiance to the Net and to the planetary political space it inaugurated.” In other words, creating a netizen global space along with contributing to a more netizen determined nation state.

The netizen phenomenon, Poster maintained, “will likely change the relation of forces around the globe.” Poster proposed, “In such an eventuality, the figure of the Netizen might serve as a critical concept in the politics of democratization.”

A different conception of the future that netizens may bring about has been proposed by Indian journalist Vinay Kamat who reported for the *Times of India*. He wrote, quoting something written about South Korea:

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 speak out independently of institutions or officials.

But then, referring to the growing number of netizens in China and India and the large proportion of the population in South Korea connected to the Internet, Kamat asked “Will it evolve into a 5<sup>th</sup> Estate?,” contrasting the netizen and netizen journalism to the current mainstream media which is considered the 4<sup>th</sup> Estate. Kamat questioned whether netizen online discussion will become a power replacing the mainstream media. “Will social and political discussion in social media grow into deliberation?” he pondered. “Will opinions expressed be merely, ‘rabble rousing’ or will they be ‘reflective’ instead of impulsive?”<sup>5</sup>

Articles such as these raise serious questions and hopes for the future, and they are just a few examples of the manifold articles being published around the world raising such questions about the possible impact on the future of the netizen and netizen journalism and netizen democracy. Such examples inspire me to hope that the new book will give some focus and encouragement to those raising such questions and exploring such visions for the future.

---

Notes:

1. The chapter can be seen at <http://www.columbia.edu/~rh120/ch106.x01>. The whole book can be seen at: <http://www.columbia.edu/~rh120/>
2. See for example, “Netizens in Egypt and the Republic of Tahrir Square”: <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/ronda2014/egypt.txt>
3. Haiqing Yu, “From Active Audience to Media Citizenship: The Case of Post-Mao China.” A version is online at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233195520\\_From\\_Active\\_Audience\\_to\\_Media\\_Citizenship\\_The\\_Case\\_of\\_Post-Mao\\_China](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233195520_From_Active_Audience_to_Media_Citizenship_The_Case_of_Post-Mao_China)
4. Mark Poster, *Information Please*, Duke University Press, Durham, 2006, p. 70.
5. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/edit-page/ampnbspsWe-are-looking-at-the-fifth-estate/articleshow/11133662.cms>

---

## What is a Netizen?\*

by Michael Hauben

The story of netizens is an important one. In conducting research in 1993 online to determine people’s uses for 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.

I started using local BBSs in Michigan in 1985. After seven years of participation on both local hobbyist-run computer bulletin boards systems, and global Usenet, I began to research Usenet and the Internet. I found the online discussions to be mentally invigorating and welcoming of thoughtful comments, questions and discussion. People were also friendly and considerate of others and their questions. This was a new environment for me. Little thoughtful conversation was encouraged in my high school. Since my daily life did not provide places and people to talk with about real issues and real world topics, I wondered why the online experience encouraged such discussions and consideration of others. Where did such a culture spring from, and how did it arise? During my sophomore year of college in 1992, I was curious to explore and better understand this new online world.

As part of course work at Columbia University, I explored these questions. One professor’s encouragement helped me to use Usenet and the Internet as places to conduct research. My research was real participation in the online community by exploring how and why these communications forums functioned. I posed questions on Usenet, mailing lists and freenets. Along with these questions, I would attach some worthwhile preliminary research. People respected my questions and found the preliminary research helpful. The entire process was one of mutual respect and sharing of research and ideas. A real notion of ‘community’ and ‘participation’ takes place. I found that on the Net people willingly help each other and work together to define and address issues important to them. These are often important issues which the conventional media would never

cover.

My initial research concerned the origins and development of the global discussion forum Usenet. For my second paper, 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 toward 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 email answers to people and provide help to new-comers, who maintain 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. However, these are not all people. Netizens are not just anyone who comes online, and they are especially not people who come online for individual gain or profit. They are not people who come to the Net thinking it is a service. Rather they are people who understand it takes effort and action on each and everyone's part to make the Net a regenerative and vibrant community and resource. Netizens are people who decide to devote time and effort into making the Net, this new part of our world, a better place. Lurkers are not netizens, and vanity home pages are not the work of netizens. While lurking or trivial home pages do not harm the Net, they do not contribute either.

The term netizen has spread widely since it was first coined. The genesis comes from net culture based on the original newsgroup naming conventions. Network wide Usenet newsgroups included net.general for general discussion, net.auto for discussion of autos, net.bugs for discussion of Unix bug reports, and so on. People who used Usenet would prefix terms related to the online world with the word NET similar to the newsgroup terminology. So there would be references to net.gods, net.cops or net.citizens. My research demonstrated that there were people active as members of the network, which the term net.citizen does not precisely represent. 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.

Two general uses of the term netizen have

developed. The first is a broad usage to refer to anyone who uses the Net, for whatever purpose. Thus, the term netizen has been prefixed in some uses with the adjectives good or bad. The second usage is closer to my understanding. This definition is used to describe people who care about Usenet and the bigger Net and work toward building the cooperative and collective nature which benefits the larger world. These are people who work toward developing the Net. In this second case, netizen represents positive activity, and no adjective need be used. Both uses have spread from the online community, appearing in newspapers, magazines, television, books and other offline 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. During such a period it is valuable to look back at the pioneering vision and actions that have helped make the Net possible and examine what lessons they provide. That is what we have tried to do in these chapters.

---

\*This article is the Preface in *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet* by Michael Hauben and Ronda Hauben, 1997, IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA.

---

## What the Net Means to Me

by Michael Hauben

The Net means personal power in a world of little or no personal power (of those other than on the top – who are called powerful because of money, but not because of thoughts or ideas.) The essence of the Net is Communication, of personal communication between individual people, and between individuals and those who in society who care (and do not care) to listen. The closest parallels I can think of are:

- Samizdat Literature in Eastern Europe.
- People's Presses – *The Searchlight* (UAW Local 659), *Appeal to Reason*, Penny Press Newspapers, etc.
- Citizen's Band Radio.
- Amateur or Ham radio.

However the Net seems to have grown farther and be more accessible than the above. The audience is larger, and continues to grow. In addition communication via the Net allows easier control over the information – as it is digitized and can be stored, replied to, and easily adapted to another format.

The Net is the vehicle for distribution of people's ideas, thoughts and yearnings. What commercial service deals with the presentation of ideas? I do not need a computer to order flowers from FDT or clothes from the Gap. I need the Net to be able to voice my thoughts, artistic impressions, and opinions to the rest of the world. The world will then be a judge as to if they are worthy by either responding or ignoring my contribution.

Throughout history (at least in the USA), there has been a phenomenon of the Street Corner Soapbox. People would “stand up” and make a presentation of some beliefs or thoughts they have. There are very few soapboxes in our society today. The 1970s and 1980s wiped out public expression to the public via the financial crisis and growing sentiment of ‘put your money where your mouth is.’ In the late 80s and early 90s, the Net emerged as a forum for public expression and discussion. The Net is partially a development from those who were involved with the Civil Rights, Anti-war struggles and free speech movements in the 1960s. The personal computer is also a development by some of these same people.

Somehow the social advances rise from the fact that people are communicating with other people to help them undermine the upper hand other institutions have. An example is people in California keeping tabs on gas station prices around the state using Netnews. More examples of people reviewing music – rather than telling others, you should really go buy the latest issue of Magazine X (Rolling Stones, etc.) as it has a great review. This is what I mean by people power – people individually communicating to present their take on something rather than saying go get commercial entities' X view from place Y. This is people contributing to other people to make a difference in people's lives. In addition, people have debated commercial companies' opposition to the selling of used CDs. This conversation is done in a grassroots way – people are questioning the music industry's profit making grasp on the music out there.

The industry definitely puts profit ahead of artistic merit, and people are not interested in the industry's profit making motive, but rather great

music.

The Net is allowing two new avenues not available to the average person before:

1. A way of expressing one's voice – when that voice generally does not have a place in the normal political order.
2. A way of organizing and questioning other people's experiences so as to have a better grip on a question or a problem.

Thus, in some ways there is a means of regaining control of one's life from society.

These are all reasons why I feel so passionately about 1) keeping the Net open to everyone, and having such connections being available publically, and 2) Keeping the Net uncommercialized and unprivatized. Commercialism will lead to growing emphasis on serving-oriented rather than sharing-oriented uses of the Net. Like I said before, it is NOT important for me to be able to custom order my next outfit from the Gap or any other clothing store. Companies should develop their own networks if they wish to provide another avenue to sell their products. In addition, commercial companies will not have it in their interest to allow people to use the Net to realize their political self. Again let me reemphasize, when I say politics, I mean power over our lives, and surroundings, and this type of politics I would call democracy.

---

## **Participatory Democracy From the 1960s and SDS into the Future Online**

by Michael Hauben

The 1960s was a time of people around the world struggling for more of a say in the decisions of their society. The emergence of the personal computer in the late 70s and early 80s and the longer gestation of the new forms of people-controlled communication facilitated by the Internet and Usenet in the late 80s and today are the direct descendants of 1960s.

The era of the 1960s was a special time in America. Masses of people realized their own potential to affect how the world around them worked.

People rose up to protest the ways of society which were out of their control, whether to fight against racial segregation, or to gain more power for students in the university setting. The 1962 "Port Huron Statement" (PHS) created by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was a document which helped set the mood for the decade.

By the 1970s, some of the people who were directly involved in student protests continued their efforts to bring power to the people by developing and spreading computer power in a form accessible and affordable to individuals. The personal computer movement of the 1970s created the personal computer. By the mid 1980s they forced the corporations to produce computers which many more people could afford. The new communications media of the Internet grew out of the ARPANET research that started in 1969 and Usenet which was born in 1979. These communication advances coupled with the availability of computers transforms the spirit of the 1960s into an achievable goal for our times.

## SDS and the Need for Participatory Democracy

The early members of SDS found a real problem in American Society. They felt that the United States was a democracy that never existed, or rather which was transformed into a representative system after the constitutional convention. The United States society is called a democracy, but had ceased being democratic after the early beginnings of American society. SDS felt it is crucial for people to have a part in how their society is governed. SDS leaders had an understanding of democratic forms which did not function democratically in the 1960s nor do they today. This is a real problem which the leaders and members of SDS intuitively understood and worked to change.

An important part of the SDS program included the understanding of the need for a medium to make it possible for a community of active citizens to discuss and debate the issues affecting their lives. While not available in the 1960s, such a medium exists today since the 1990s. The seeds for the revival of the 1960s SDS vision of how to bring about a more democratic society now exist in the personal computer and the Net. These seeds will be an important element in the battle for winning control for people in the new millennium.

## The Port Huron Statement and Deep Problems with American Democracy

The Port Huron Statement was the foundation on which to build a movement for participatory democracy in the 1960s. In June 1962, an SDS national convention was held in a UAW camp located in the backwoods of Port Huron, Michigan. The original text of the Port Huron Statement was drafted by Tom Hayden, who was then SDS Field Secretary. The Statement sets out the theory of SDS's criticism of American society. The Port Huron convention was itself a concrete living example of the practice of participatory democracy.

The Port Huron Statement was originally thought of as a manifesto, but SDS members moved instead to call it a "statement." It was prefixed by an introductory note describing how it was to be a document that should develop and change with experience:

This document represents the results of several months of writing and discussion among the membership, a draft paper, and revision by the Students for a Democratic Society national convention meeting in Port Huron, Michigan, June 11-15, 1962. It is presented as a document with which SDS officially identifies, but also as a living document open to change with our times and experiences. It is a beginning: in our own debate and education, in our dialogue with society. (PHS, in Miller, p. 329)

This note is important in that it signifies that the SDS document was not defining the definite solution to the problems of society, but was making suggestions that would be open to experiences toward a better understanding. This openness is an important precursor to practicing participatory democracy by asking for the opinions of everyone and treating these various opinions equally.

The first serious problem inherent in American society identified by the Port Huron Statement is the myth of a functioning democracy:

For Americans concerned with the development of democratic societies, the anti-colonial movements and revolutions in the emerging nations pose serious problems. We need to face the

problems with humanity; after 180 years of constitutional government we are still striving for democracy in our own society. (PHS, in Miller, p. 361)

This lack of democracy in American society contributes to the political disillusionment of the population. Tom Hayden and SDS were deeply influenced by the writings of C. Wright Mills, a philosopher who was a professor at Columbia University until his death early in 1962. Mills' thesis was that the "the idea of the community of publics" which make up a democracy had disappeared as people increasingly got further away from politics. Mills felt that the disengagement of people from the State had resulted in control being given to a few who in the 1960s were no longer valid representatives of the American people. In his book about SDS, *Democracy is in the Streets*, James Miller wrote:

Politics became a spectator sport. The support of voters was marshaled through advertising campaigns, not direct participation in reasoned debate. A citizen's chief sources of political information, the mass media, typically assaulted him with a barrage of distracting commercial come-ons, feeble entertainments and hand-me-down glosses on complicated issues. (Miller, p. 85)

Such fundamental problems with democracy continue today. In the Port Huron Statement, SDS was successful in identifying and understanding the problems which still plague us today. This is a necessary first step to working toward a solution. The students involved with SDS understood people were tired of the problems and wanted to make changes in society. The Port Huron Statement was written to address these concerns:

... do they not as well produce a yearning to believe there is an alternative to the present, that something can be done to change circumstances in the school, the workplaces, the bureaucracies, the government? It is to this latter yearning, at once the spark and engine of change, that we direct our present appeal. The search for a truly democratic alternatives to the present, and a commitment to social experimentation with them, is a wor-

thy and fulfilling human enterprise, one which moves us, and we hope, others today. (SDS, "The Introduction, Agenda for Change," PHS, in Miller, p. 331)

Describing how the separation of people from power is the means used to keep people uninterested and apathetic, the Port Huron Statement explains:

The apathy is, first, subjective – the felt powerlessness of ordinary people, the resignation before the enormity of events. But subjective apathy is encouraged by the objective American situation – the actual structural separation of people from power, from relevant knowledge, from pinnacles of decision-making. Just as the university influences the student way of life, so do major social institutions create the circumstances which the isolated citizen will try hopelessly to understand the world and himself. ("The Society Beyond," PHS, in Miller, p. 336)

The Statement analyzes the personal disconnection to society and its effect:

The very isolation of the individual – from power and community and ability to aspire – means the rise of democracy without publics. With the great mass of people structurally remote and psychologically hesitant with respect to democratic institutions, those institutions themselves attenuate and become, in the fashion of the vicious cycle, progressively less accessible to those few who aspire to serious participation in social affairs. The vital democratic connection between community and leadership, between the mass and the several elites, has been so wrenched and perverted that disastrous policies go unchallenged time and again. (PHS, in Miller, p. 336)

The Statement describes how it is typical for people to get frustrated and quit going along with the electoral system as something which works. The problem has continued, as we now have all time lows in voter turn-outs for national and local elections. In a section titled Politics Without Publics, the State-

ment explains:

The American voter is buffeted from all directions by pseudo-problems, by the structurally initiated sense that nothing political is subject to human mastery. Worried by his mundane problems which never get solved, but constrained by the common belief that politics is an agonizingly slow accommodation of views, he quits all pretense of bothering. (PHS, in Miller, p. 337)

Students in SDS did not let these real problems discourage their efforts to work for a better future. They wanted to be part of the forces to defeat the problems. The Port Huron Statement contains an understanding that people are inherently good and can deal with the problems that were described. This understanding is conveyed in the Values section of the Statement:

Men have unrealized potential for self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding, and creativity. It is this potential that we regard as crucial and to which we appeal, not to the human potential for violence, unreason, and submission to authority. The goal of man and society should be human independence: a concern not with the image of popularity but with finding a meaning in life that is personally authentic; a quality of mind not compulsively driven by a sense of powerlessness, nor one which unthinkingly adopts status values, nor one which represses all threats to its habits, but one which easily unites the fragmented parts of personal history, one which openly faces problems which are troubling and unresolved; one with an intuitive awareness of possibilities, an active sense of curiosity, an ability and willingness to learn. (PHS, in Miller, p. 332)

## Participatory Democracy

Those participating in the Port Huron convention came away with a sense of the importance of participatory democracy. This sense was in the air in several ways. The convention itself embodied participatory democracy through the discussion and debate

over the text of the Statement as several people later explained. The Port Huron Statement called for the implementation of participatory democracy as a way to bring people back into decisions about the country in general, and their individual lives, in particular. One of Tom Hayden's professors at University of Michigan, Arnold Kaufman, came to speak about his thoughts and use of phrase 'participatory democracy.'

Miller writes that in a 1960 essay, "Participatory Democracy and Human Nature," Kaufman had described a society in which every member had a "direct responsibility for decisions." The "main justifying function" of participatory democracy, quotes Miller, "is and always has been, not the extent to which it protects or stabilizes a community, but the contribution it can make to the development of human powers of thought, feeling and action. In this respect, it differs, and differs quite fundamentally, from a representative system incorporating all sorts of institutional features designed to safeguard human rights and ensure social order." (Miller, p. 94)

"Participation" explained Kaufman, "means both personal initiative – that men feel obliged to help resolve social problems – and social opportunity – that society feels obliged to maximize the possibility for personal initiative to find creative outlets." (Miller, p. 95)

A participant at the Port Huron Conference, Richard Flacks remembers Arnold Kaufman speaking at the convention:

At one point, he declared that our job as citizens was not to role-play the President. Our job was to put forth our own perspective. That was the real meaning of democracy – press for your own perspective as you see it, not trying to be a statesman understanding the big picture. (Miller, p. 111)

After identifying participatory democracy as the means of how to wrest control back from corporate and government bureaucracies, the next step was to identify the means to having participatory democracy. In the "Values" section of The Port Huron Statement, the means proposed is a new media that would make this possible:

As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the qual-



ity and direction of his life; the society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation. (PHS, in Miller, p. 333)

Others in SDS further detailed their understandings of participatory democracy to mean people becoming active and committed to playing more of a public role. Miller documents Al Haber's idea of democracy as "a model, another way of organizing society." The emphasis was on a charge to action. It was how to be out there doing. Rather than an ideology or a theory." (Miller, pp. 143-144)

Tom Hayden, Miller writes, understood participatory democracy to mean:

number one, action; we believed in action. We had behind us the so-called decade of apathy; we were emerging from apathy. What's the opposite of apathy? Active participation. Citizenship. Making history. Secondly, we were very directly influenced by the civil rights movement in its student phase, which believed that by personally committing yourself and taking risks, you could enter history and try to change it after a hundred years of segregation. And so it was this element of participation in democracy that was important. Voting was not enough. Having a democracy in which you have an apathetic citizenship, spoon-fed information by a monolithic media, periodically voting, was very weak, a declining form of democracy. And we believed, as an end in itself, to make the human being whole by becoming an actor in history instead of just a passive object. Not only as an end in itself, but as a means to change, the idea of participatory democracy was our central focus. (Miller, p. 144)

Another member of SDS, Sharon Jeffrey understood "Participatory" to mean "involved in decisions." She continued, "And I definitely wanted to be involved in decisions that were going to affect me! How could I let anyone make a decision about me that I wasn't involved in?" (Miller, p. 144)

It is important to see the value of participatory democracy as a common understanding among both

the leaders and members of SDS. While the Port Huron Statement contained other criticisms and thoughts, its major contribution was to highlight the need to more actively involve the citizens of the United States in the daily political process to correct some of the wrongs which passivity had allowed to build. Richard Flacks summarizes this in his article, "On the Uses of Participatory Democracy":

The most frequently heard phrase for defining participatory democracy is that 'men must share in the decisions which affect their lives.' In other words, participatory democrats take seriously a vision of man as citizen: and by taking seriously such a vision, they seek to extend the conception of citizenship beyond the conventional political sphere to all institutions. Other ways of stating the core values are to assert the following: each man has responsibility for the action of the institutions in which he is embedded ... . (Flacks, 1971, pp. 397-398)

## The Need for Community for Participatory Democracy

The leaders of SDS strove to create forms of participatory democracy within its structure and organization as a prototype and as leadership for the student protest movement and society in general. Al Haber, the University of Michigan graduate student who was the first SDS national officer, describes the need for a communication system to provide the foundation for the movement:

The challenge ahead is to appraise and evolve radical alternatives to the inadequate society of today, and to develop an institutionalized communication system that will give perspective to our immediate actions. We will then have the groundwork for a radical student movement in America. (Sale, p. 25)

He understood the general society would be the last place to approach. There was a need to start smaller among the element of society that was becoming more active in the 1960s or the students. Haber outlined his idea of where to start:

We do not now have such a public

[interaction in a functioning community] in America. Perhaps, among the students, we are beginning to approach it on the left. It is now the major task before liberals, radicals, socialists and democrats. It is a task in which the SDS should play a major role. (Miller, p.69)

The Port Huron Statement defines 'community' to mean:

Human relations should involve fraternity and honesty. Human interdependence is a contemporary fact; . . . Personal links between man and man are needed.' (Sale, p. 332)

Prior to his full time involvement with SDS, Hayden wrote an article for the *Michigan Daily* describing how democratic decision making is a necessary first step toward creating community. Hayden's focus was on the University when he wrote:

If decisions are the sole work of an isolated few rather than of a participating many, alienation from the University complex will emerge, because the University will be just that: "a complex, not a community." However, this sentiment persisted in Hayden's and others thoughts about community and democracy for the whole country. (Miller, p. 54)

This feeling about community is represented in the Port Huron Statement's conclusion. The Statement calls for the communal sharing of problems to see that they are public and not private problems. Only by communicating and sharing these problems through a community will it be a chance to solve them together. SDS called for the new left to "transform modern complexity into issues that can be understood and felt close-up by every human being." The statement continues, "It must give form to the feelings of helplessness and indifference, so people may see the political, social and economic sources of their private troubles and organize to change society. . . ." (PHS, in Miller, p. 374)

The theory of participatory democracy was engaging. However, the actual practice of giving everyone a say within the SDS structures made the value of participatory democracy clear. The Port Huron Convention was a real life example of how the principles were refreshing and capable of bringing

American citizens back into political process. The community created among SDS members brought this new spirit to light. C. Wright Mills writings spoke about "the scattered little circles of face-to-face citizens discussing their public business." Al Haber's hope for this to happen among students was demonstrated at Port Huron. SDS members saw this as proof of Mills' hope for democracy. This was to be the first example of many among SDS gatherings and meetings. Richard Flacks highlighted what made Port Huron special. He found a "mutual discovery of like minds." Flacks continued, "You felt isolated before, because you had these political interests and values and suddenly you were discovering not only like minds, but the possibility of actually creating something together." It was also exciting because, "it was our thing: we were there at the beginning." (Miller, p. 118)

## The Means for Change

SDS succeeded in doing several things. First, they clearly identified the crucial problem in American democracy. Next, they came up with an understanding of what theory would make a difference. All that remained was to find the means to make this change manifest. They discovered how to create changes in their own lives and these changes affected the world around them. However, something more was needed to bring change to all of American society.

Al Haber understood this something more would be an open communication system or media which people could use to communicate. He understood that, "the challenge ahead is to appraise and evolve radical alternatives to the inadequate society of today, and to develop an institutionalized communication system that will give perspective to our immediate actions." (Sale, p. 25) This system would lay the "the groundwork for a radical student movement in America." (Sale, p. 25) Haber and Hayden understood SDS to be this, "a national communications network." (Miller, p. 72)

While many people made their voices heard and produced a real effect on the world in the 1960s, lasting structural changes were not established. The real problems outlined earlier continued in the 1970s and afterwards. A national, or even international, public communications network needed to be built to keep the public's voice out in the open.

Members of SDS partially understood this,

and put forth the following two points in the Port Huron Statement section on “Toward American Democracy”:

1. Mechanisms of voluntary association must be created through which political information can be imparted and political participation encouraged.
2. The allocation of resources must be based on social needs. A truly ‘public sector’ must be established, and its nature debated and planned. (PHS, in Miller, p. 362)

## International Public Communications Network – or the Net

This network and the means to access it began developing toward the end of the 1960s. Two milestones in the genesis were 1969 when the first ARPANET node was installed and in 1979 when Usenet started. Both were pioneering experiments in using computers to facilitate human communication in a fundamentally different way than already existing public communications networks like the telephone or television networks. The ARPANET, which was a prototype for today’s Internet, and Usenet, which for a time continued to grow and expand around the world, were parts of the Net, or the worldwide global computer communication networks. Another important step toward the development of an international communication network was the personal computer movement, which took place in the middle to late 1970s. This movement created the personal computer which makes it affordable for an individual to purchase the means to connect to this public network.

However, the network can not simply be created. SDS understood that “democracy and freedom do not magically occur, but have roots in historical experience; they cannot always be demanded for any society at any time, but must be nurtured and facilitated.” (PHS, in Miller, p. 361)

Participants on the ARPANET, Internet and Usenet inherently understood this, and built a social and knowledge network from the ground up. As Usenet was created to help students who did not have access to the ARPANET, or a chance to communicate in a similar way, they came to it in full force. In “Culture and Communication: The Interplay in the New Public Commons,” Michael Hauben writes that the online user is part of a global culture and consid-

ers him or herself to be a global citizen. This global citizen is a net citizen, or a netizen. The world which has developed is based on communal effort to make a cooperative community. Those who have become netizens have gained more control of their lives and the world around them. However, access to this world needs to spread in order to have the largest possible effect for the most number of people. In addition, as some efforts to spread the Net became more commercial, some of the values important to the Net were being challenged.

A speech I was invited to present at a conference on “the Netizen Revolution and the Regional Information Infrastructure” in Beppu, Japan helps to bring the world of the netizen into perspective with the ideas of participatory democracy:

Netizens are not just anyone who comes online, and they are especially not people who come online for isolated gain or profit. They are not people who come to the Net thinking it is a service. Rather they are people who understand it takes effort and action on each and everyone’s part to make the Net a regenerative and vibrant community and resource. Netizens are people who decide to devote time and effort into making the Net, this new part of our world, a better place. (Hauben, “Netizens and Community Networks,” 1995)

The Net is a technological and social development which is in the spirit of the theory clearly defined by the Students for a Democratic Society. This understanding could help in the fight to keep the Net a uncommercialized public commons (Felsenstein). This many to many medium provides the tools necessary to bring the open commons needed to make participatory democracy a reality. It is important now to spread access to this medium to all who understand they could benefit.

The Net brings power to people’s lives because it is a public forum. The airing of real problems and concerns in the open brings help toward the solution and makes those responsible accountable to the general public. The Net is the public distribution of people’s muckraking and whistle blowing. It is also just a damn good way for people to come together to communicate about common interests and to come into contact with people with similar and differing

ideas.

The lack of control over the events surrounding an individual's life was a common concern of protesters in the 1960s. The Port Huron Statement gave this as a reason for the reforms SDS was calling for. The section titled "The Society Beyond" included that "Americans are in withdrawal from public life, from any collective efforts at directing their own affairs." (PHS, in Miller, p. 335)

Hayden echoed C. Wright Mills when he wrote, "What experience we have is our own, not vicarious or inherited." Hayden continued, "We keep believing that people need to control, or try to control, their work and their life. Otherwise, they are without intensity, without the subjective creative consciousness of themselves which is the root of free and secure feeling. It may be too much to believe, we don't know." (Miller, p. 262)

The desire to bring more control into people's daily life was a common goal of student protest in the 1960s. Mario Savio, active in the Berkeley Free Speech movement, "believed that the students, who paid the university to educate them, should have the power to influence decisions concerning their university lives." (Haskins and Benson, p. 55) This desire was also a common motivator of the personal computer movement.

## THE PERSONAL COMPUTER MOVEMENT

The personal computer movement immediately picked up after the protest movements of the 1960s died down. Hobbyist computer enthusiasts wanted to provide access to computing power to the people. People across the United States picked up circuit boards and worked on making a personal mini-computer or mainframe which previously only large corporations and educational institutions could afford. Magazines, such as *Creative Computing*, *Byte* and *Dr. Dobbs' Journal*, and clubs, such as the Homebrew Club, formed cooperative communities of people working toward solving the technical problems of building a personal and inexpensive computer.

Several pioneers of the personal computer movement contributed to the tenth anniversary issue of *Creative Computing Magazine*. Some of their impressions follow:

The people involved were people with vision, people who stubbornly clung

to the idea that the computers could offer individuals advantages previously available only to large corporations ... (Leyland, p. 111)

Computer power was meant for the people. In the early 70s computer cults were being formed across the country. Sol Libes on the East Coast and Gordon French in the West were organizing computer enthusiasts into clubs ... (Terrell, p. 100)

We didn't have many things you take for granted today, but we did have a feeling of excitement and adventure. A feeling that we were the pioneers in a new era in which small computers would free everyone from much of the drudgery of everyday life. A feeling that we were secretly taking control of information and power jealously guarded by the Fortune 500 owners of multi-million dollar IBM mainframes. A feeling that the world would never be the same once "hobby computers" really caught on. (Marsh, p. 110)

There was a strong feeling [at the Homebrew Club] that we were subversives. We were subverting the way the giant corporations had run things. We were upsetting the establishment, forcing our mores into the industry. I was amazed that we could continue to meet without people arriving with bayonets to arrest the lot of us.

## THE NET and CONCLUSION

The development of the Internet and of Usenet have been an investment in a strong force toward making direct democracy a reality. These and other 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. One criticism is that it would be impossible to assemble the body politic in person at a single time. The Net allows for a meeting which takes place on each person's own time, rather than all at one time. Usenet newsgroups provided discussion forums where questions were raised, and people could leave comments when convenient, rather than at a

particular time and at a particular place. As a computer discussion forum, individuals can connect from their own computers, or from publicly accessible computers across the nation to participate in a particular debate. The discussion takes place in one concrete time and place, while the discussants can be dispersed. Usenet newsgroups and mailing lists have proven that citizens can both do their daily jobs and participate in discussions that interest them within their daily schedules.

Another criticism was that people would not be able to communicate peacefully after assembling. Online discussions do not have the same characteristics as in-person meetings. As people connect to the discussion forum when they wish, and when they have time, they can be thoughtful in their responses to the discussion. Whereas in a traditional meeting, participants have to think quickly to respond. In addition, online discussions allow everyone to have a say, whereas finite length meetings only allow a certain number of people to have their say. Online meetings allow everyone to contribute their thoughts in a message, which is then accessible to whomever else is reading and participating in the discussion.

New communication technologies hold the potential for the implementation of direct democracy in a country as long as the necessary computer and communications infrastructure are installed. Future advancement toward a more responsible government is possible with such new technologies. While the future is discussed and planned for, it will also be possible to use such technologies to assist in the citizen participation in government. Netizens are watching various government institutions on various online forums and mailing lists throughout the global computer communications network. People's thoughts about and criticisms of their respective governments are being aired on the currently uncensored networks.

These networks can revitalize the concept of a democratic "Town Meeting" via online communication and discussion. Discussions involve people interacting with others. Voting involves the isolated thoughts of an individual on an issue, and then his or her acting on those thoughts in a private vote. In society where people live together, it is important for people to communicate with each other about their situations to best understand the world from the broadest possible viewpoint.

The individuals involved with SDS, the per-

sonal computer movement and the pioneers involved with the development of the Net understood they were a part of history. This spirit helped them to push forward in the hard struggle needed to bring the movements to fruition. The invention of the personal computer was one step that made it possible for people to afford the means to connect to the Net. The Internet has emerged as a laboratory for democracy available to the public. It is important that the combination of the personal computer and the Net be spread and made widely available at low or no costs to people around the world. It is important to understand the tradition which these developments have come from, in order to truly understand their value to society and to make them widely available. With the hope connected to this new public communications medium, I encourage people to take up the struggle which continues in the great American radical tradition.

---

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Felsenstein, Lee. "The Commons of Information." In *Dr. Dobbs' Journal*. May 1993. <http://besser.tsoa.nyu.edu/impact/s94/speakers/felsenstein/felsenstein-article.html>
- Flacks, Richard. "On the Uses of Participatory Democracy". In *Dissent*. No 13. November 1966. pp. 701-708. Reprinted in *The American Left*. Edited by Loren Baritz. 1971. pp. 397-405.
- Freiberger, Paul and Michael Swaine. *Fire in the Valley: The Making of the Personal Computer*. Osborne/McGraw-Hill. Berkeley. 1984.
- Haskins, James and Kathleen Benson. *The 60s Reader*. Viking Kestrel. New York. 1988.
- Hauben, Michael. "Culture and Communication: The Interplay in the New Public Commons – Usenet and Community." 1995. <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/CS/usenet-culture.txt>
- Hauben, Michael and Ronda Hauben. *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. 1994 <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/netbook/>
- Hauben, Michael. "Netizens and Community Networks." Presentation at Hypernetwork '95, Beppu Bay Conference. November 24, 1995. Beppu Bay, Oita Prefecture, Japan. <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/text/bbc95spch.txt>
- Leyland, Diane Asher. "As We Were." In *Creative Computing*. Vol 10 no 11. November, 1984. pp. 111-112.
- Marsh, Robert. "1975: Ancient History." In *Creative Computing*. Vol 10 no 11. November, 1984. pp. 108-110.
- Miller, James. *Democracy in the Streets*. Simon and Schuster. New York. 1987
- Port Huron Statement (PHS). June 15, 1962. As found in Miller. pp. 329-374.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. SDS. Vintage Books. New York, 1974.
- Terrell, Paul. "A Guided Tour of Personal Computing." In

[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 Masters thesis:

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 behaviors, 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 adaptation. Culture (particular): The way of life characteristic of a particular human society (Nanda, 1991, p. G-3). (North, 1994, chapter 4.2.1)

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 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 observes 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:

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.” (Mead, 1978, p. 5)

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 their 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 but for more advanced societies. 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:

... 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. (Mead, 1978, pp. 153-154)

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 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, webpages and social media 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 access 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 online 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. (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” (North, 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. (North, 1994, chap. 4.2.2)

Rather, those who use the Net live in their daily offline 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 offline global culture. While the online culture strongly contributes to the developing global culture offline, 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 or use of Internet connectivity available from an Internet service provider. 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 grassroots medium, or a new enlarged public commons (Felsenstein, 1993).

The online culture is primarily a written one, but there are an increasing number of videos and podcasts, 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. These nontext items are primarily transferred and not modified, thought upon or communally worked on as are the textual ideas, but the comments often resemble a conversation. 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 has changed. 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 or video, 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 voice-less 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*, [Online]. Institute for HyperNetwork Society, Center for Global Communications (GLOCOM), International University of Japan. Available: <http://www.nira.or.jp/past/publ/review/95autumn/aizu.html>

Appadurai, Arjun. (1990). “Disjuncture and Difference in the

Global Cultural Economy,” *Public Culture*, 2 1–24.

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

Barnouw, V. (1987). *An Introduction to Anthropology: Ethnology*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.

Ember, C. R. & M. Ember. (1990). *Cultural Anthropology*. 6<sup>th</sup> 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* [Online]. Available: <http://www.reststop.net/cybercom/cgvcl.html>

Graham, Garth. (March 29, 1995). *A Domain Where Thought is Free to Roam: The Social Purpose of Community Networks*. Prepared for Telecommunities Canada for CRTC Public Hearings on Information Highway [Online]. Available: [http://www.ncf.ca/ncf/freeport2html/conferences/access95/reading/crtc\\_bri.txt.html](http://www.ncf.ca/ncf/freeport2html/conferences/access95/reading/crtc_bri.txt.html)

Harris, M. (1988). *Culture, People, Nature: an Introduction to General Anthropology*. 5<sup>th</sup> 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*. 3<sup>rd</sup> 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*. 4<sup>th</sup> 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*, Volume 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>

---

[Editor's Note: Beginning in March, 1993, Michael Hauben started research by posting questions to Usenet, an international online forum system, to Freenet community networks, and to some mailing lists. In response to inquiries about the uses of the net that people had found up until that time, he received many enthusiastic replies. Based on this data, he wrote "Common Sense: The Net and Netizens," which appeared online on July 6, 1993.<sup>1</sup> The following article is a version of his 1993 post with slight changes to make it more readable for the current reader.]

## **The Net and Netizens: The Impact the Net has on People's Lives**

by Michael Hauben

### **Preface**

Welcome to the 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

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, other physical networks, and other logical networks and so on – has rapidly grown to cover all of the countries in the world. Everyday more computers attach to the existing networks and every new computer adds to the user base. As of 2020, at least 4.57 billion active Internet users are interconnected.<sup>1</sup>

We are seeing a revitalization of society. The

frameworks are being redesigned from the bottom up. A new more democratic world is becoming possible. As one user observed, the Net has "immeasurably increased the quality of ... life." The Net seems to open a new lease on life for people. Social connections which never before were possible, or relatively hard to achieve, are now facilitated by the Net. Geography and time are no longer 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 distribution of information from the central Network Broadcasting 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. The Net 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 yet exist, and it is still a struggle 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, or social media tags. 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 followup 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. When I posted the question, “Is the Net a Source of Social/Economic Wealth?” many people responded. Several corrected my calling the net a source of accurate information. They pointed out that it was also a source of opinions. However, the reader can train himself to figure out the accurate information from the breadth of opinions. Presented here is an example of the broadness of views and opinion which I was able to gather from my research in the early 1990s on the Net. The Net can be a helpful medium to understand the world. Only by seeing all points of view can anyone attempt to figure out his or her position on a topic.

Net society differs from offline 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 online information that is carried by the various computer networks. Netizens can interact with other people to help add to or alter that information. Brainstorming 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.

## Introduction

The world of the netizen was envisioned more than fifty years ago by J. C. R. Licklider. Licklider brought to his leadership of the Department of Defense’s ARPA Information Processing Techniques Office (IPTO) a vision of “the intergalactic computer network.” Whenever he would speak, he would mention this vision. J. C. R. Licklider was a prophet of the Net. In the paper, “The Computer as a Communication Device” (1968), which Licklider wrote with Robert Taylor, they established several principles from their observations of how the computer would play a helpful role in human communication.<sup>2</sup> They clarified their definition of communication as a creative process differentiating between communication and the sending and receiving of information. When two tape recorders send or receive information to each other that is not communication. They wrote:

We believe that communicators have to do something non-trivial with the information they send and receive. And to interact with the richness of living information – not merely in the passive way that we have become accustomed to using books and libraries, but as active participants in an ongoing process, bringing something to it through our interaction with it, and not simply receiving from it by our connection to it. We want to emphasize something beyond its one-way transfer: the increasing significance of the jointly constructive, the mutually reinforcing aspect of communication – the part that transcends ‘now we both know a fact that only one of us knew before.’ When minds interact, new ideas emerge. We want to talk about the creative aspect of communication.<sup>3</sup>

Licklider and Taylor defined four principles for computers to make a contribution toward human communication. They are:

1. Communication is defined as an interactive creative process.
2. Response times need to be short to make the “conversation” free and easy.
3. Larger networks would form out of smaller regional networks.

4. Communities would form out of affinity and common interests.

Licklider and Taylor's understandings from their 1968 paper have stood the test of time, and do represent the Net today. A later paper Licklider co-wrote with Albert Veza, "Applications of Information Networks,"<sup>4</sup> explores the possible business applications of information networks. Licklider and Veza's survey of business applications in 1978 come short of the possibilities Licklider and Taylor outlined in their 1968 paper, and represent but a tiny fraction of the resources the Net currently embodies.

In the 1968 paper, Licklider and Taylor focused on the Net being comprised of a network of networks. While other researchers of the time focused on the sharing of computing resources, Licklider and Taylor had a bigger vision 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. Let us assume for a moment that such a network has been formed. Through the network of message processors, 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.<sup>5</sup>

Their concept of the sharing of both computing and human resources together matches the modern 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 been worked out.

The various available discussion tools on the Net are extremely dynamic. Most can be formed immediately for either short or long term use. As interests or events form, discussion groups can be created, e.g., a mailing list, 9NOV89-L, about Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall appeared already in November, 1989.

The virtual space created on noncommercial

computer networks is accessible universally. The content on commercial networks in the 1990s, like CompuServe or America On Line, were only accessible by those who paid to belong to that particular network. The space on noncommercial networks is accessible from the connections that exist, whereas social networks in the physical world generally are connected 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 need not mean limited resources any more – 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. As long as access is limited – the Net and those on the Net, lose the full 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 Net.

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 was very exciting for me. When posting 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 email. It is nice that there can be reminders of how exciting this new form of communication really is –

so that the value of this new use of computers is never forgotten.

## Critical Mass

The Net has grown so much since its birth in the 1960s 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. There are enough people online now, that anyone coming online will find something of interest. People are meshing intellects and knowledge to form new ideas. As early as 1990, Larry Press made this clear by writing, "I now work on the Net at least two 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 L.A., but in cyberspace."

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. Today, many different kinds of people are connected to the Net. The original users of the Net (then several test-beds of network research) were from only a few parts of the world. Now 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, the network of the National Physical Laboratory 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. First, it provided the physical and electrical communications backbone for development of the latent social infrastructure we now call 'THE INTERNET COMMUNITY.'"<sup>6</sup>

Starting in the early 1990s, many different kinds of people comprised the Net. The university community sponsored access for a broad range of people (i.e., students, professors, staff, professor emeritus, etc.). Many businesses were also connected. A "K-12 Net" existed which invited younger people to be a part of the online community. Special bulletin board software existed to connect personal computer users to the Net. Various Unix bulletin board systems existed to connect other users. It was virtually impos-

sible to tell what kind of people connected to public bulletin board systems, as only a computer (or terminal) and modem were the prerequisites to connect.<sup>7</sup> By 2020, almost five billion users connected to the internet.

In addition to the living body of resources the diversity of netizens represents, there is also a continually growing body of digitized data that forms another body of resources. Whether it was netizens digitizing great literature of the past (e.g., the Gutenberg Project, Project Bartleby), or it is people gathering otherwise obscure or non-mainstream material (e.g., various religions, unusual hobbies, gay lifestyle, fringe.), or if it is netizens contributing new and original material, the Net follows in the great tradition of other public 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 created with the principle of being available to everyone. An early example was the method of connecting to file repositories via FTP (file transfer protocol) by logging in as an "anonymous" user. Most World Wide Web Sites, Wide Area Information Systems (WAIS), and gopher sites were open for all users of the Net. It is true that the Net Community was smaller in the 1990s than it is now, but even then the Net had reached a point of general usefulness no matter who you were.

All of this evidence is exactly why it is a problem for the Net to come under the control of commercial entities. If ever commercial interests gain complete 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 was an example of one commercial network. A user of Compuserve paid for access by the hour. 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 benefited from the

control and power of the people at the grassroots level, and because these people developed it. People's posts and contributions to the Net have been the developing forces.

## Grassroots

The Net brings people together. People put into connection with other people can be powerful. There is power in numbers. The Net allows an individual to realize his power. The Net, uncontrolled by commercial entities, becomes the gathering, discussion and planning center for many people.

The combined efforts of people interested in communication has led to the development and expansion of the global communications system. What's on the Net? Well – email, library catalogs, free software, electronic newsletters and journals, Multi-User Domain/Dungeon (mud)/mush/moo, WhatsApp, We Chat, the multimedia world wide web (WWW), video-sharing and podcast hosting platforms, and many kinds of data banks. Different servers attempt to order and make utilizing the vast varieties and widespread information easier. There exist both public and private services and sources of information. The public and free services often come about through the voluntary efforts of one or a few people. These technologies allow a person to help make the world a better place by making his or her unique contribution available to the rest of the world. People who have been overlooked or have felt unable to contribute to the world, now can. Also, these networks allow much more open and public interaction over a much larger body of people than available before. The common people have a unique voice which is now being aired in a new way.

The emphasis is that the Net introduces every single person as someone special and in possession of a useful resource.

## Netizen Comments on Grassroots from the 1990s

From Brian May:

Simple by access to a vast amount of information and an enormous number of brains!

From Simon Raboczi:

For a geographically sparse group as it is, MU\* allows people to get to know one another, the relevant newsgroup

gives a sense that there's a community out there and things are happening, and an associated ftp site allows art and writing to be distributed.

From Brent Edwards:

In summary, nets have helped enormously in the dissemination of information from people knowledgeable in certain areas which would be difficult to obtain otherwise.

From Rosemary Warren:

I get to communicate rapidly and cheaply with zillions of people around the world.

The following examples help to show how this is possible. People are normally unprotected from the profit desires of large companies. Steven Alexander from California was using the Net to try to prevent over-charging at gas stations. This is an example of the power of connecting people to uphold what is fair and in the best interest of the common person in this society.

From Steven Alexander:

I have started compiling and distributing (on the newsgroup ca.driving) a list of gas prices at particular stations in California to which many people will contribute and keep up to date, and which, I hope, will allow consumers to counteract what many of us suspect is the collusive (or in any case, price-gouging) behavior of the oil companies.

A user from Germany also reported using the Net to muckrake:

A company said they were a [non-profit organization]. Someone looked them up in the [nonprofit] Register, and they did not exist there. Someone else said that he had contact with the person who sent the letter, only under another company-name, and that he simply ignored this person since he looked like a swindler. So they are swindlers, and people from the Net proved it to us, we then of course did not engage with them at all.

The Net has proven its importance in other contemporary critical situations. As the only available line of communications with the rest of the world, the



Net helped defeat the attempted coup in the ex-Soviet Union in 1990. The members of the coup either did not know about or understand the role the Russian RELCOM network could play or the connections proved resilient enough for information about the coup to be communicated inside and out of the country in time to inform the world and encourage resistance to the coup.<sup>8</sup>

The Net has also proven its value by providing an important medium for students. Students participating in the 1989 Chinese “Pro-Democracy” movement were kept in touch with others around the world via their fragile connection to the Net. The Net provided an easy way of evading government censors to get news around the world about events in China and to receive back encouraging feedback. Such feedback was vital support to keep the fight on when it seemed impossible or wrong to do so. In a similar way, students in France used the French Minitel system to organize a successful fight against plans by the French government to restrict admission to government subsidized universities.

The information flow on the Net is controlled by those who use the Net. People actively provide the information that they personally and other people want. There is a much more active form of participation than what is provided for by other forms of mass media. Television, radio, magazines are all driven by those who own and determine who will write for them. The Net gives people a media they can control. This control of information is a great power that has not been available before to the common everyday person. For example, Declan McCreesh describes how this made possible access to the most up to date information.

From Declan McCreesh:

You get the most up to date info. that people around the world can get their hands on, which is great. For instance, the media report who wins a Grand Prix, what happened and not a great deal more. On the net, however, you can get top speeds, latest car and technology developments, latest rumors, major debates as to whether Formula 1 or Indy cars are better etc.

The Net helps to make the information available more accurate because of the many-to-many or broadcast and read and write capability. That new capability, which is not normally very prevalent in

our society, allows an actual participant or observer to report something. This capability gives the power of journalism or the reporter to the individual. This new medium allows the source to report. This is true because the medium allows everyone online to make a contribution. The old media instead controls who reports and what they say. The possibility of eyewitness accounts via the net can make the information more accurate. Also this opens up the possibility for a grassroots network. Information is passed from person to person around the world. Thus German citizens could learn about the 1986 Chernobyl explosion from the Net before the government decided to release the information to the public via the media. The connection is people to people rather than governments to governments. Citizen Journalists can now distribute to more than those they know personally. The distribution of the writings of ordinary people is the second step after the advent of the inexpensive personal computer in the early 1980s. The personal computer and printer allowed anyone to produce mass quantities of documents. Personal publishing is now joined by wide personal distribution.

Not only is there grassroots reporting, but the assumption that filtering is necessary has been challenged. People can learn to sort through the various opinions themselves. Steve Welch disagreed that the Net is a source of more accurate information, but agreed that people develop discriminatory reading skills.

From Steve Welch:

When you get more information from diverse sources, you don't always get more accurate information. However, you do develop skills in discerning accurate information. Or rather, you do if you want to come out of the infoglut jungle alive.

Governments that rule based on control of information will succumb eventually to the tides of democracy. As Dr. Sun Yat-Sen of the Chinese Democracy Movement once said, “The worldwide democratic trend is mighty. Those who submit to it will prosper and those who resist it will perish.” The Net reintroduces the basic idea of democracy as the grassroots people power of netizens. Governments can no longer easily keep information from their people.

Many groups which do not have an established form of communications available to them

have found the Net to be a powerful tool. For example, for people far away from their homeland, the Net provides a new link.

From Godfrey Nolan:

The Net has immeasurably increased the quality of my life. I am Irish, but I have been living in England for the past five years. It is a lot more difficult to get information about Ireland than you would expect. However a man called Liam Ferrie who works in Digital in Galway, compiles a newspaper on the weeks events in Ireland and so I can now easily keep abreast of most developments in Irish current affairs, which helps me feel like I'm not losing touch when I go home about twice a year. It is also transmitted to about 2000 Irish people all over the first and third worlds.

From Madhur K. Limdi:

I read your above posting and wanted to share my experience with you. I have been a frequent reader of news in Usenet groups, such as soc.culture.indian, misc.news.southasia. Both of these keep me reasonably informed about the happenings in my home country India.

Also in the United States, the Net has provide stable communications for people of various religious and sexual persuasions. Many other communities have also found the Net to be a excellent medium to help increase communications:

From Gregory G. Woodbury:

We will be going to a march on Washington and are coordinating our plans and travel with a large number of other folks around the country via email and conversations on Usenet.

From Jann VanOver:

I'm a member of a Buddhist organization and just found a man in Berkeley who keeps a Mailing List that sends daily guidance and discussions for this group. So I get a little religious boost when I log on each day.

From Carole E. Mah:

For me and for many of my friends, the Net is our main form of communi-

cation. Almost every aspect of interpersonal communication on the network has a gay/lesbian/bi aspect to it that forms a tight and intimate acquaintanceship which sometimes even boils over into arguments and enmities. This network of connections, friends, enemies, lovers, etc. facilitates political goals that would not otherwise be possible (organizing letter-writing campaigns about the Gays in the Military Ban via the ACT-UP list, being able to send email directly to the White House, finding out about activism, bashing, etc. in other states and around the world, etc).

From Robert Dean:

As a member of the science fiction community, I've met quite a few people on the net, and then in person.

### Communication with New People

In many netizens' lives the Net has alleviated feelings of loneliness, which seem common in today's society. The Net's ability to help people network both socially and intellectually makes the Net valuable and irreplaceable in people's lives. This is forming a group of people who want to keep the Net accessible and open to all.

The Net brings together people from diverse walks of life and makes it easier for these people to communicate. It brings them together into the same virtual space and removes the impact or influence of first impressions.

From Malcolm Humes:

I'm in awe of the power and energy linking thousands into a virtual intellectual coffee-house, where strangers can connect without the formalities of face to face rituals (hello, how are you today) to allow a direct-connect style of communication that seems to transcend the 'how's the weather' kind of conversation to just let us connect without the bullshit.

Strangers are no longer strange on the Net. People are free to communicate without limits, fears or apprehension. It used to be that there was a rather generous atmosphere that thrived on the Net and that welcomed new users. People were happy to help

others, often as a return for the help they had received. Things have changed, and the general welcome to new-comers is not as universally friendly, but there are many online who still try and help new people. Others are nasty, but the goodwill still overpowers the unfriendly comments.

From Jean-Francois Messier:

My use of the Net is to get in touch with more people around the world. I don't know for what, when, how, but that's important for me. Not that I'm in a small town, far from everybody, but that I want to be able to establish links with others. In fact, because of those nets I use, I would !NOT! want to go to a small town, just because the phone calls would be too expensive. I've to say that I'm not an expressive people. I'm not a great talker, nor somebody who could make shows. I'm more an 'introvert'.

Yet Jean-Francois wrote me. This is just one example of the social power of the Net. Another netizen comments on how the Net helped her befriend strangers.

From Laura Goodin:

Last summer I was traveling to Denver and I used a listserv mailing list to find out whether a particular running group I run with had a branch there. They did, and I had a wonderful time meeting people with a common interest (and drinking beer with them); I was no longer a stranger.

## Broadened and Worldly Prospective

Easy connection to people and ideas from around the world has a powerful effect. Awareness that we are members of the human species which spans the entire globe changes a person's point of view. It is a broadening perspective. It is very easy for people to assume a limited point of view if they are only exposed to certain ideas. The Net brings the isolated individual into contact with other people, experiences, and views from the rest of the world. Exposure to many opinions gives the reader a chance to actually consider multiple views before settling on a specific opinion. Having access to the "Marketplace of Ideas" allows a person to make a reasoned judgment.

From Jean-Francois Messier:

My attitudes to other peoples, races and religions changed, since I had more chances to talk with other peoples around the world. When first exchanging mail with people from Yellowknife, Yukon, I had a real strange feeling: Getting messages and chatting with people that far from me. I noticed around me that a lot of people have opinions and positions about politics that are for themselves, without knowing others.

Because I have a much broader view of the world now, I changed and am more conciliatory and peaceful with other people. Writing to someone you never saw, changes the way you write, also, the instancy of the transmission makes the conversation much more 'live' than waiting for the damn slow paper mail. Telecommunications opened the world to me and changed my visions of people and countries.

From Anthony Berno:

I could not begin to tell you how different my life would be without the Net. My life would be short about a dozen people, some of them central, I would be wallowing in ignorance on several significant subjects, and my mind would be lacking many broadening and enlightening influences.

From Henry Choy:

More things to look at. Increased perspective on life. The computer network brings people closer together, and permits them to speak at will to a large audience. I recommend that the telecommunications and computer industry make large scale computer networking accessible to the general public. It's like making places accessible to the handicapped. People brought closer together will release some existing social tensions. People need to be heard, and they need to hear.

From Paul Ready:

You don't have to go to another country to meet people from there. It is not

the same as personally knowing them, but I always pay special attention to information from people outside the States. They are likely to have a different perspective on things.

From Leandra Dean:

I love to study people, and the Net has been the best possible resource to this end. The Net is truly a window to the world, and without it we could only hope to physically meet virtually thousands of people everyday to gain the same insights. I shudder to think about how different and closed in my life would be without the Net.

## Material Changes to People's Lives and Lifestyles

The time spent online can affect the rest of a person's life. The connections, interfaces or collaborations between times on and offline form an interesting area of study. Netizens attest to the power of the Net by explaining the effect the Net has had on their lives. Because of the information available and the new connections possible, people have changed the way they live their lives. There are examples of both changes in the material possessions and changes in lifestyle. The changes in lifestyle are probably the more profound changes, but the new connections made possible are important. Often the material gains are not financial. Rather worthwhile goods can be redistributed from those to whom the goods might have lost personal value to those who would value the goods.

## Netizen Comments on Material Changes

From William Carroll:

Primarily because of the information and support from rec.bikes, three years ago I gave up driving to work and started riding my bike. It's one of the best decisions I've ever made.

A response received via email:

When I started using ForumNet (a chat program similar to IRC, but smaller) back in January 1990, I was fairly shy and insecure . . . I had a few close friends but was slow at making new ones. Within a few weeks, on

ForumNet, I found myself able to be open, articulate, and well-liked in this virtual environment. Soon, this discovery began to affect my behavior in "real" face-to-face interaction. I met some of my computer friends in person and they made me feel so good about myself, like I really could be myself and converse and be liked and wanted.

Of course, computer-mediated social interaction is not properly a crutch to substitute for face-to-face encounters, but the ability to converse via keyboard and modem with real people at the other end of the line has translated into the real-life ability for me to reach out to people without the mediating use of a computer. My life has improved. I wouldn't trade my experience with the Net for anything.

From Jack Frisch:

I must begin my comments on the Internet with one simple yet significant statement: the availability and use of the Internet is changing my life profoundly.

From Carole E. Mah:

I also used to facilitate a vegetarian list, which radically altered many people's lives, offering them access to mail-order foods, recipes, and friendship via net-contact with people who live in areas where non-meat alternatives are readily available.

From Jann VanOver:

Well, the first thing I thought of is purchases I've made through the Net which have 'changed my life' I drove my Subaru station wagon until last fall when I acquired a VW Camper van that I saw on a local Net ad. I wasn't looking for a van, wasn't even shopping for another vehicle, but the second time this ad scrolled by me, I looked into it and eventually bought it. I will certainly say that driving a 23 year old VW camper van has changed my life!

I thought I would be ridiculed, but

have found that people have a lot of respect and admiration for this car! Through the Net, I heard that Roger Waters was going to perform "The Wall" again, an event I had promised myself not to miss, so I made a trip to Berlin (East and West) in 1990 to see this concert. This was CERTAINLY a life changing event, seeing Berlin less than one week after the roads were open with no checkpoints required. I don't think I would have known about it soon enough if not for the Net.

From Robert Dean:

As for me, my main hobby is and was playing wargames and role-playing games. Net access has allowed me to discuss these games with players across the world, picking up new ideas, and gathering opinions on new games before spending money on them. In addition, I've been able to buy and sell games via Net connections, allowing me to adjust my collection of games to meet my current interests, and get games that I no longer wanted to people who do want them, whether they live down the road from me in Maryland, or in Canada, Austria, Finland, Germany or Israel. I have also taken an Esperanto course via email, and correspond irregularly in Esperanto with interested parties world wide.

From Caryn K. Roberts:

Usenet & Internet are available to me at work and by dial-up connection to work from home. I have been materially enriched by the use of the Net. I have managed to sell items I no longer needed. I have been able to purchase items from others for good prices. I have saved money and am doing my part to recycle technology instead of adding burdens to the municipal waste disposal service.

Using the Net I have also been enriched by discussions and information found in numerous newsgroups from sci.med to sci.skeptic to many of the

comp.\* groups. I have offered advice to solve problems and have been able to solve problems I had by using information in these forums.

## The Net as a Source of Enormous Resources

Before the Net was widely seen as an enormous social network, some were experimenting with the sharing of computing resources. The following are some examples of ways netizens utilize the information resources available on the Net.

From Tim North:

I'm faculty here at University and I use the Net as a major source of technical information for my lectures, up-to-date product information, and informed opinion. As such I find that I am constantly better informed than the people around me. (That sounds vain, but it's not meant to be. It's simply meant to emphasize how strongly I feel that the Net is a superb information resource.)

From R. J. White:

I used the Net to find parts for my 1971 Opel GT. I was living in North America at the time, and going through the normal channels, like GM, are no good. The Net was like an untapped resource.

From John Harper:

[My] uses of the network [1] I once asked a question about an obscure point in history of math on the sci.math newsgroup and got a useful answer from Exeter, U.K. Beforehand I had no idea where anyone knowing the answer might be. I had drawn a blank in Oxford. [2] I asked a question about a slightly less obscure point on comp.lang.fortran which generated a long (and helpful) discussion on the Net for a week or two.

From Paul Ready:

Yes, it is a worldwide rapid distribution center of information, on topics both popular and obscure. It may not make the information more valuable,

but it certainly increases the information, and the propagation of information. To those connected, it is a valuable resource. Flame wars aside, a lot of generally inaccessible information is readily available.

From Lee Rothstein:

Usenet and mailing lists create a group of people who are motivated and capable of talking about a specific topic. The software allows deeply contextual conversations to occur with a minimum of rehash. As experience develops with the medium, each user realizes that the other that he talks to or will talk to generally help him/her, and can do him/her no harm because of the remoteness imposed by the cable.

From Lu Ann Johnson:

Hi! Usenet came to my rescue I'm a librarian and was working with a group of students on a marketing project. They were marketing a make-believe product; a compact-disc of "music hits of the 70s." They needed a source to tell them how much it cost to produce a CD without mastering, etc. I exhausted all my print resources so I posted the question in a business newsgroup. Within hours I learned from several companies that it cost about \$1.50 to produce a CD. :) The students were very grateful to get the information.

From Laura Goodin:

I teach self-defense, and in rec.martial-art someone posted information about a study on the effectiveness of Mace for self-defense that I had been looking for for years.

From Cliff Roberts:

I have been using Internet through a program in New Jersey to bring the fields of Science and Math to grammar school children grades K-8. We have implemented a system where the class rooms are equipped with PC's and are able to dial in to a UNIX system. There they can send email and

post questions to a KidsQuest ID. The ID then routes the questions to volunteers with accounts on UNIX. The scientists then answer or give advice of where to find the information they want. Another well accepted feature is to list out the soc.penpals list and email people in different countries that are being studied in the schools.

From Joe Farrenkopf:

I think Usenet is a very interesting thing. For me, it's mostly just a way to pass time when bored. However, I have gotten some very useful things from it. There is one group in particular called comp.lang.fortran, and on several occasions when I've had a problem writing a program, I was able to post to this group to get some help to find out what I was doing wrong. In these cases, it was an invaluable resource.

## Collective Work

As new connections are made between people, more ideas travel over greater distances. This allows either like-minded people or complementary people to come in touch with each other. The varied resources of the networks allow these same people to keep in touch even if they would not have been able to be in touch before. Electronic mail allows enough detail to be contained in a message that most if not all communications can take place entirely electronically. This medium allows for new forms of collaborative work to form and thrive. New forms of research will probably arise from such possibilities. Here are some examples:

From Wayne Hathaway:

One 'unusual' use I made of the Net happened in 1977. Along with five other 'Net Folks' I wrote the following paper: 'The ARPANET Telnet Protocol: Its Purpose, Principles, Implementation, and Impact on Host Operating System Design,' with Davidson, Postel, Mimno, Thomas, and Walden: Fifth Data Communications Symposium, Snowbird, UT; September 27-29, 1977. What's so unusual about a collaborative paper,

you ask? Simply that the six of us never even made a TELEPHONE call about the paper, much less had a meeting or anything. Literally EVERYTHING – from the first ideas in a ‘broadcast’ mail to the distribution of the final ‘troff-ready’ version – was done with email. These days this might not be such a deal, but it was interesting back then.

From Paul Gillingwater:

... in Vienna was an online computer mediated art forum, with video conferencing between two cities, plus an online discussion in a virtual MUD-type conference later that evening. A Response I received via email: In response to your question about having fun on the net, and being creative, one incident comes to mind. I had met a woman on ForumNet (a system like IRC). She and I talked and talked about all sorts of things. One night, we felt especially artistic. We co-wrote a poem over the computer. I’d type a few words, she’d pick up where I left off (in the middle of sentences or wherever) and on and on. I don’t think we had any idea what it was going to be in the end, thematically or structurally. In the end, we had a very good poem, one that I would try to publish if I knew her whereabouts anymore.

## Improving Quality of Everyday Life

Information flow can take various shapes. The strangest and perhaps most interesting one is how emotion can be attached to information flow. They often seem like two very different things. I received a large number of responses that reported real-life marriages arising from Net meetings. The Net facilitates the meeting of people of like interests. The newness of the Net even after 30 years means we cannot fully understand it as of yet. However, it is worth noting that people have also broken up online. So while it is a new social medium, a range of dynamics will exist.

From Caryn K. Roberts:

I have found friends on the Net. A lover. And two of the friends I met, also met online and got married. I attended the wedding (in California).

From Scott Kitchen:

I think I can add something for your paper. I met my fiancee four years ago over the net. I was at Ohio State, and she was in Princeton, and we started talking about an article of hers I’d read in rec.games.frp. We got to talking, eventually met, found we liked each other, and the rest is history. We were married 31 December 1994.

From Gregory G. Woodbury:

I met the woman who became my wife when I started talking to the folks at “phs” (the third site of the original Usenet) during the development of Netnews. I would not have been wandering around that area if I hadn’t been interested in the development of the net.

From Laura Goodin:

And now, the BEST story: about eight months ago I was browsing soc.culture.australia and I noticed a message from an Australian composer studying in the U.S. about an alternative tune to “Waltzing Matilda.” I was curious, so I responded in email, requesting the tune and just sort of shooting the breeze. We began an email correspondence that soon incorporated voice calls as well. One thing led inexorably to another and we fell in love (before we met face to face, actually). We did eventually meet face to face. Last month he proposed over the Internet (in soc.culture.australia) and I accepted. Congratulatory messages came in from all over the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. Houston (that’s his name) and I keep our phone bills from resembling the national debt by sending 10 or 12 emails a day (we’re well over 1400 for eight months now), and chatting using IRC. A long-distance relationship is hellish, but the pain is eased somewhat by the

Internet.

From Chuq Von Rospach:

(oh, and in the “how the Net made my non-net life better” category, I met my wife via the net. Does that count?)

## Work

The fluid connections and the rapidly changing nature of the networks make the Net a welcome media for those who are job hunting and for those who have jobs to offer. The networks have a large turnover of people who are looking for jobs. The placement of job announcements is easy and can be kept available for as long as the job is offered. Email allows for the quick and easy applications by sending resumes in the email. Companies can respond quickly and easy to such submissions, also by email. Besides finding work, the Net helps people who are currently working perform their job in the best manner. Many people utilize the Net to assist them with their jobs. Several examples of each follow:

From Laura Goodin:

My division successfully recruited a highly-qualified consultant (a Finn living in Tasmania) to do some work for us; the initial announcement was over Usenet; subsequent negotiations were through email.

From jj:

I've hired people off the net, and from meeting them in muds, when I find somebody who can THINK. People who can think are hard to find anywhere.

From Diana Gregory:

I have learned to use UNIX, and as a result may be able to keep/advance in my job due to the 'net.'

From Neil Galarneau:

It helps me do my job (MS Windows programming) and it helps me learn new things (like C++).

From Kieran Clulow:

The Internet access provided me by the university has greatly facilitated my ability to both use and program computers and this has had the direct result of improving my grades as well as gaining me a good job in the com-

puter field. Long live the Internet (and make it possible for private citizens to get access!)

From Mark Gooley:

I got my job by answering a posting to a news-group.

From Anthony Berno:

I develop for NEXTSTEP, and the Net is very useful in getting useful programming hints, info on product releases, rumors, etcetera.

From Gregory G. Woodbury:

Due to contacts made via Usenet and email, I got a job as a consultant at BTL in 1981 after I lost my job at Duke. Part of the qualifications that got me in the door was experience with Usenet.

## Improved Communications with Friends

Another way of improving daily life is by making communications with friends easier. The ease of sending email bought back letter writing. However, the immediacy of email meant less care could be made in the process of writing. Email, chat platforms and forums make it much easier to keep in touch with friends outside one's local area.

## Netizen Comments on Improved Communications

From Bill Walker:

I also have an old and dear friend (from high school) who lives in the San Francisco area. After I moved to San Diego, we didn't do very well at keeping in touch. She and I talked on the phone a couple of times a year. After we discovered we were both on the net, we started corresponding via email, and we now exchange mail several times a week. So, the Net has allowed me to keep in much closer touch with a good friend. It's nothing that couldn't be done by phone, or snail mail, but somehow we never got around to doing those things. Email is quick, easy and fun enough that we don't put it off.

From Anthony Berno:



Incidentally, it is also one of my primary modes of communication with my sister (who lives in N.Z.) It's more meditative than a phone call, faster than a letter, and cheaper than either of them.

From Carole E. Mah:

It also facilitates great friendships. Most of my friends, even in my own town, I met on the network. This can often alleviate feelings of loneliness and "I'm the only one, I must be a pervert" feelings among queer people just coming out of the closet. They have a whole world of like-minded people to turn to on Usenet, on BITNET lists, on IRC, in personal email, on BBSs and AOL type conferences, etc.

From Jann VanOver:

Apart from purchases, I have been contacted by:

1. a very good friend from college who I'd lost track of. She got married to a man she met in a singles newsgroup (they've been married 2 years+)
2. someone who went to my high school, knew a lot of the same people I did, but we didn't know each other. We are now 'mail buddies'
3. an old girlfriend of my brothers. They went out for eight years, but I learned more about her from ONE email letter than I had ever learned when meeting her in person.

From Godfrey Nolan:

Above all it helps me keep in touch with friends who I would inevitably lose otherwise. The Net helps those that move around for economic reasons to lessen the worst aspects of leaving your friends in the series of places that you once called home. It's the best thing since sliced bread.

## Problems

With all of the positive uses and advantages of the Net, it is still not perfect. The blind-view of people on the Net seems to shield everyone, but in the

1990s not women. Then, there was a relatively large male to female percentage population on the Net. Women online could feel the effects of this difference. Women who had easily identifiable user names or IDs were prone to be the center of much attention. While that might have been good in itself, much of that attention was of a hostile or negative nature. By 2019, in the U.S. the ratio was virtually one-to -one and the prevalence of harassment of women is lower. But Net harassment continues against other users. Also, people with unpopular ideas need to be strong to withstand the outlash of abuse they might receive from others.

The worst non-people problem seems to be information overflow. Information adds up very quickly and it can be hard to organize it all and sort through. This problem should be solvable as technology is being developed to handle it.

From Scott Hatton:

There is a problem with this brave new world in that a lot of people don't appreciate there's another human being at the other keyboard. Flaming is a real problem – especially in comp.misc. This is all a new facet of the technology as well. People rarely trade insults in real life like they do on Internet. There's a tendency to stereotype your opponent into categories. I think this is because you're not around to witness the results. I find this more on Internet newsgroups than on CompuServe. I think this is down to maturity – a lot of folk on the Internet are students who aren't paying for their time on the system. Those on CompuServe are normally slightly older, not so hotheaded and are paying for their time. Damn. Now I'm at stereotyping now. It just goes to show.

From Joe Farrenkopf:

There is something else I've discovered that is really rather fascinating. People can be incredibly rude when communicating through this medium. For example, some time ago, I posted a question to lots of different newsgroups, and many people felt my question was inappropriate to their particular group. They wrote to me

and told me so, using amazingly nasty words. I guess it's easier to be rude if you don't have to face a person, but can say whatever you want over a computer.

From Brad Kepley:

I get a little irritated with people always claiming someone else is 'wasting bandwidth' because they disagree with them. About half the time it turns out that the person being told to shut up was right after all. Then again, when you look at things like alt.binaries.pictures.erotica and other 'non-bandwidth-wasting' activities, it seems almost comical to me when someone says this. There is nothing more wasteful than 95% of what Usenet is used for. It's a joke to say that a particular person is 'wasting' it. To say that they are off-topic makes more sense. I guess this is just a gripe rather than what you are looking for. Wasting bandwidth again. :)

## Conclusion

For the people of the world, the Net provides a powerful means for 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 deserves to be appreciated and protected. Any medium or tool that helps people to hold or gain power is something that is special and has to be protected.

The Net has made a valuable impact on human society. My research in the 1990s demonstrated people's lives had been substantially improved via their connection to the Net. This sets the basis for providing access to all in society. Using similar reasoning, in 1978 J. C. R. Licklider and Robert Taylor believed that access to the then growing information network should be made ubiquitous. They felt that the Net's value would depend on high connectivity. In their article, "The Computer as a Communication Device," they argued that the impact upon society depends on how available the network is to the society as a whole.<sup>9</sup>

Society will improve if Net access is made available to people as a whole. Only if access is universal will the Net itself 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.

From Steve Welch:

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 communications 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.

---

## Notes:

1. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/617136/digital-population-worldwide/> and <https://ourworldindata.org/internet>
2. J. C. R. Licklider and Robert W. Taylor, "The Computer as a Communication Device," reprinted in *In Memoriam: J. C. R. Licklider 1915-1990*, Digital Research Center, August 7, 1990; originally published in *Science and Technology*, April, 1968.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
4. "Proceedings of IEEE," vol. 66 no. 11, November, 1978.
5. J. C. R. Licklider and Robert W. Taylor, p. 32.
6. Stefferud, Einar et. al., "Quotes from Some of the Players," *ConneXions – The Interoperability Report*, vol. 3 no. 10, Foster City, California. October, 1989, p. 21.
7. The original version of this article also gave other details about the Net in the 1990s. By the mid-1990s. many if not all Fidonet BBSs (a very common BBS type) had at least email and many also participated through a gateway to Netnews. Prototype community network systems were forming around the world (e.g., Cleveland Free-Net, Wellington Citynet, Santa Monica Public Electronic Network (PEN), Berkeley Community Memory Project, Hawaii FYI, Capitol Free-Net and others in Canada, etc.). Access via these community systems could be as easy as visiting the community library and membership was open to all who live in the community.
8. See article by Larry Press posted on the comp.risks newsgroup, September 6, 1991.

9. Ibid., J. C. R. Licklider and Robert W. Taylor, p. 40.

---

Much thanks is owed to the many who contributed Usenet posts and email responses to requests for examples of how the Net has changed people's lives. Only a few of the many replies received could be quoted but all contributed to this work. In the 1990s, the following people who were quoted chose that their email addresses be included:

Jim Carroll [jcarroll@jacc.com](mailto:jcarroll@jacc.com),

Kieran Clulow [u1036254@vmsuser.acsu.unsw.edu.au](mailto:u1036254@vmsuser.acsu.unsw.edu.au),

Robert Dean [robdean@access.digex.net](mailto:robdean@access.digex.net),

Jack Frisch [frischj@gbms01.uwgb.edu](mailto:frischj@gbms01.uwgb.edu),

Scott Hatton [100114.1650@compuserve.com](mailto:100114.1650@compuserve.com),

Lu Ann Johnson [ai411@yfn.ysu.edu](mailto:ai411@yfn.ysu.edu),

Jean-Francois Messier [messier@igs.net](mailto:messier@igs.net),

Larry Press [lpress@isi.edu](mailto:lpress@isi.edu),

Chuq Von Rospach [chuqui@plaidworks.com](mailto:chuqui@plaidworks.com),

Gregory G. Woodbury [news@wolves.durham.nc.us](mailto:news@wolves.durham.nc.us)

---

1. The first draft in three parts can be accessed from: [https://www.ais.org/~hauben/Michael\\_Hauben/Collected\\_Works/Posts/1993\\_Common\\_Sense\\_Usenet\\_Posts/](https://www.ais.org/~hauben/Michael_Hauben/Collected_Works/Posts/1993_Common_Sense_Usenet_Posts/)

---

The opinions expressed in articles are those of their authors and not necessarily the opinions of the *Amateur Computerist* newsletter. We welcome submissions from a spectrum of viewpoints.

### **ELECTRONIC EDITION**

**ACN Webpage:**

<http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/>

All issues from 1988 to present of the *Amateur Computerist* are on-line at:

<http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/NewIndex.pdf>

### **EDITORIAL STAFF**

Ronda Hauben

William Rohler

Norman O. Thompson

Michael Hauben (1973-2001)

Jay Hauben

The *Amateur Computerist* invites submissions.

Articles can be submitted via e-mail:

[jrh29@columbia.edu](mailto:jrh29@columbia.edu)

Permission is given to reprint articles from this issue in a non profit publication provided credit is given, with name of author and source of article cited.