Manifestos

Contents

III   2010 – 2015   **87**

%

Part I

1974 – 1999

Computer Lib

Any nitwit can understand computers, and many do. Unfortunately, due to ridiculous historical circumstances, computers have been made a mystery to most of the world. And this situation does not seem to be improving. You hear more and more about computers, but to most people it's just one big blur. The people who *know* about computers often seem unwilling to explain things or answer your questions. Stereotyped notions develop about computers operating in fixed ways – and so confusion increases. The chasm between laymen and computer people widens fast and dangerously .

This book is a measure of desperation, so serious and abysmal is the public sense of confusion and ignorance. Anything with buttons or lights can be palmed off on the layman as a computer. There are so many different things, and their differences are so important; yet to the lay public they are lumped together as "computer stuff," indistinct and beyond understanding or criticism. It's as if people couldn't tell apart camera from exposure meter or tripod, or car from truck or tollbooth. This book is therefore devoted to the premise that

EVERYBODY SHOULD UNDERSTAND COMPUTERS.

It is intended to fill a crying need. Lots of everyday people have asked me where they can learn about computers, and I have had to say nowhere. Most of what is written about computers for the layman is either unreadable or silly. (Some exceptions are listed nearby; you can go to them instead of this if you

want.) But virtually nowhere is the big picture simply enough explained. Nowhere can one get a simple, soup-to-nuts overview of what computers are really about, without technical or mathematical mumbo-jumbo, complicated examples, or talking down. This book is an attempt.

(And nowhere have I seen a simple book explaining to the layman the fabulous wonderland of computer graphics which awaits us all, a matter which means a great deal to me personally, as well as a lot to all of us in general. That's discussed on the flip side.)

Computers are simply a necessary and enjoyable part of life, like food and books. Computers are not everything, they are just an *aspect* of everything, and not to know this is computer illiteracy, a silly and dangerous ignorance.

Computers are as easy to understand as cameras. I have tried to make this book like a photography magazine – breezy, forceful and as vivid as possible. This book will explain how to tell apples from oranges and which way is up. If you want to make cider, or help get things right side up. you will have to go on from here.

I am not a skillful programmer, hands-on person or eminent professional; I am just a computer fan, computer fanatic if you will. But if Dr. David Reuben can write about sex I can certainly write about computers. I have written this like a letter to a nephew , chatty and personal. This is perhaps less boring for the reader, and certainly less boring for the writer, who is doing this in a hurry. Like a photography magazine, it throws at you some

rudiments in a merry setting. Other things are thrown in so you'll get the sound of them, even if the details are elusive. (We learn most everyday things by beginning with vague impressions, but somehow encouraging these is not usually felt to be respectable.) What I have chosen for inclusion here has been arbitrary, based on what might amuse and give quick insight. Any bright highschool kid, or anyone else who can stumble through the details of a photography magazine, should be able to understand this book, or get the main ideas. This will not make you a programmer or a computer person, though it may help you talk that talk, and perhaps make you feel more comfortable (or at least able to cope) when new machines encroach on your life. If you can get a chance to learn programming – see the suggestions on p. – it's an awfully good experience for anybody above fourth grade. But the main idea of this book is to help you tell apples from oranges, and which way is up. I hope you do go on from here, and have made a few suggestions.

I am "publishing" this book myself, in this first draft form, to test its viability, to see how mad the computer people get, and to see if there is as much hunger to understand computers, among all you Folks Out There, as I Ihink. I will be interested to receive corrections and suggestions for subsequent editions, if any. (The computer field is its own exploding universe, so I'll worry about up-to-dateness at that time.)

Nelson, Theodor. 1974. Computer Lib: You Can and Must Understand Computers Now; Dream Machines: New Freedoms Through Computer Screens— A

Minority Report. Self-published. ISBN
0-89347-002-3.

The GNU Manifesto

The GNU Manifesto (which appears below) was written by Richard Stallman at the beginning of the GNU Project, to ask for participation and support. For the first few years, it was updated in minor ways to account for developments, but now it seems best to leave it unchanged as most people have seen it.

Since that time, we have learned about certain common misunderstandings that different wording could help avoid. Footnotes added since 1993 help clarify these points.

For up-to-date information about the available GNU software, please see the information available on our web server, in particular our list of software. For how to contribute, see http://www.gnu.org/help/help.html.

What's GNU? Gnu's Not Unix!

GNU, which stands for Gnu's Not Unix, is the name for the complete Unix-compatible software system which I am writing so that I can give it away free to everyone who can use it.(1) Several other volunteers are helping me. Contributions of time, money, programs and equipment are greatly needed.

So far we have an Emacs text editor with Lisp for
writing editor commands, a source level debugger, a
yacc-compatible parser generator, a linker, and
around 35 utilities. A shell (command interpreter) is
nearly completed. A new portable optimizing C
compiler has compiled itself and may be released this
year. An initial kernel exists but many more features
are needed to emulate Unix. When the kernel and
compiler are finished, it will be possible to distribute a
GNU system suitable for program development. We
will use TeX as our text formatter, but an nroff is
being worked on. We will use the free, portable X
Window System as well. After this we will add a
portable Common Lisp, an Empire game, a
spreadsheet, and hundreds of other things, plus
online documentation. We hope to supply, eventually,
everything useful that normally comes with a Unix
system, and more.

GNU will be able to run Unix programs, but will not be
identical to Unix. We will make all improvements that
are convenient, based on our experience with other
operating systems. In particular, we plan to have
longer file names, file version numbers, a crashproof
file system, file name completion perhaps,
terminal-independent display support, and perhaps
eventually a Lisp-based window system through
which several Lisp programs and ordinary Unix
programs can share a screen. Both C and Lisp will be
available as system programming languages. We will
try to support UUCP, MIT Chaosnet, and Internet
protocols for communication.

GNU is aimed initially at machines in the
68000/16000 class with virtual memory, because

they are the easiest machines to make it run on. The extra effort to make it run on smaller machines will be left to someone who wants to use it on them.

To avoid horrible confusion, please pronounce the g in the word "GNU" when it is the name of this project.

Why I Must Write GNU

I consider that the Golden Rule requires that if I like a program I must share it with other people who like it. Software sellers want to divide the users and conquer them, making each user agree not to share with others. I refuse to break solidarity with other users in this way. I cannot in good conscience sign a nondisclosure agreement or a software license agreement. For years I worked within the Artificial Intelligence Lab to resist such tendencies and other inhospitalities, but eventually they had gone too far: I could not remain in an institution where such things are done for me against my will.

So that I can continue to use computers without dishonor, I have decided to put together a sufficient body of free software so that I will be able to get along without any software that is not free. I have resigned from the AI Lab to deny MIT any legal excuse to prevent me from giving GNU away.(2)

Why GNU Will Be Compatible with Unix

Unix is not my ideal system, but it is not too bad. The essential features of Unix seem to be good ones, and

I think I can fill in what Unix lacks without spoiling them. And a system compatible with Unix would be convenient for many other people to adopt.

How GNU Will Be Available

GNU is not in the public domain. Everyone will be permitted to modify and redistribute GNU, but no distributor will be allowed to restrict its further redistribution. That is to say, proprietary modifications will not be allowed. I want to make sure that all versions of GNU remain free.

Why Many Other Programmers Want to Help

I have found many other programmers who are excited about GNU and want to help.

Many programmers are unhappy about the commercialization of system software. It may enable them to make more money, but it requires them to feel in conflict with other programmers in general rather than feel as comrades. The fundamental act of friendship among programmers is the sharing of programs; marketing arrangements now typically used essentially forbid programmers to treat others as friends. The purchaser of software must choose between friendship and obeying the law. Naturally, many decide that friendship is more important. But those who believe in law often do not feel at ease with either choice. They become cynical and think that programming is just a way of making money.

By working on and using GNU rather than proprietary programs, we can be hospitable to everyone and obey the law. In addition, GNU serves as an example to inspire and a banner to rally others to join us in sharing. This can give us a feeling of harmony which is impossible if we use software that is not free. For about half the programmers I talk to, this is an important happiness that money cannot replace.

How You Can Contribute

> (Nowadays, for software tasks to work on, see the High Priority Projects list and the GNU Help Wanted list, the general task list for GNU software packages. For other ways to help, see the guide to helping the GNU operating system.)

I am asking computer manufacturers for donations of machines and money. I'm asking individuals for donations of programs and work.

One consequence you can expect if you donate machines is that GNU will run on them at an early date. The machines should be complete, ready to use systems, approved for use in a residential area, and not in need of sophisticated cooling or power.

I have found very many programmers eager to contribute part-time work for GNU. For most projects, such part-time distributed work would be very hard to coordinate; the independently written parts would not work together. But for the particular task of replacing Unix, this problem is absent. A complete Unix system

contains hundreds of utility programs, each of which is documented separately. Most interface specifications are fixed by Unix compatibility. If each contributor can write a compatible replacement for a single Unix utility, and make it work properly in place of the original on a Unix system, then these utilities will work right when put together. Even allowing for Murphy to create a few unexpected problems, assembling these components will be a feasible task. (The kernel will require closer communication and will be worked on by a small, tight group.)

If I get donations of money, I may be able to hire a few people full or part time. The salary won't be high by programmers' standards, but I'm looking for people for whom building community spirit is as important as making money. I view this as a way of enabling dedicated people to devote their full energies to working on GNU by sparing them the need to make a living in another way.

Why All Computer Users Will Benefit

Once GNU is written, everyone will be able to obtain good system software free, just like air.(3)

This means much more than just saving everyone the price of a Unix license. It means that much wasteful duplication of system programming effort will be avoided. This effort can go instead into advancing the state of the art.

Complete system sources will be available to everyone. As a result, a user who needs changes in the system will always be free to make them himself,

or hire any available programmer or company to make them for him. Users will no longer be at the mercy of one programmer or company which owns the sources and is in sole position to make changes.

Schools will be able to provide a much more educational environment by encouraging all students to study and improve the system code. Harvard's computer lab used to have the policy that no program could be installed on the system if its sources were not on public display, and upheld it by actually refusing to install certain programs. I was very much inspired by this.

Finally, the overhead of considering who owns the system software and what one is or is not entitled to do with it will be lifted.

Arrangements to make people pay for using a program, including licensing of copies, always incur a tremendous cost to society through the cumbersome mechanisms necessary to figure out how much (that is, which programs) a person must pay for. And only a police state can force everyone to obey them. Consider a space station where air must be manufactured at great cost: charging each breather per liter of air may be fair, but wearing the metered gas mask all day and all night is intolerable even if everyone can afford to pay the air bill. And the TV cameras everywhere to see if you ever take the mask off are outrageous. It's better to support the air plant with a head tax and chuck the masks.

Copying all or parts of a program is as natural to a programmer as breathing, and as productive. It ought to be as free.

Some Easily Rebutted Objections to GNU's Goals

"Nobody will use it if it is free, because that means they can't rely on any support."

"You have to charge for the program to pay for providing the support."

If people would rather pay for GNU plus service than get GNU free without service, a company to provide just service to people who have obtained GNU free ought to be profitable.(4)

We must distinguish between support in the form of real programming work and mere handholding. The former is something one cannot rely on from a software vendor. If your problem is not shared by enough people, the vendor will tell you to get lost.

If your business needs to be able to rely on support, the only way is to have all the necessary sources and tools. Then you can hire any available person to fix your problem; you are not at the mercy of any individual. With Unix, the price of sources puts this out of consideration for most businesses. With GNU this will be easy. It is still possible for there to be no available competent person, but this problem cannot be blamed on distribution arrangements. GNU does not eliminate all the world's problems, only some of them.

Meanwhile, the users who know nothing about computers need handholding: doing things for them which they could easily do themselves but don't know how.

Such services could be provided by companies that sell just handholding and repair service. If it is true that users would rather spend money and get a product with service, they will also be willing to buy the service having got the product free. The service companies will compete in quality and price; users will not be tied to any particular one. Meanwhile, those of us who don't need the service should be able to use the program without paying for the service.

"You cannot reach many people without advertising, and you must charge for the program to support that."

"It's no use advertising a program people can get free."

There are various forms of free or very cheap publicity that can be used to inform numbers of computer users about something like GNU. But it may be true that one can reach more microcomputer users with advertising. If this is really so, a business which advertises the service of copying and mailing GNU for a fee ought to be successful enough to pay for its advertising and more. This way, only the users who benefit from the advertising pay for it.

On the other hand, if many people get GNU from their friends, and such companies don't succeed, this will show that advertising was not really necessary to spread GNU. Why is it that free market advocates don't want to let the free market decide this?(5)

"My company needs a proprietary operating system to get a competitive edge."

GNU will remove operating system software from the

realm of competition. You will not be able to get an edge in this area, but neither will your competitors be able to get an edge over you. You and they will compete in other areas, while benefiting mutually in this one. If your business is selling an operating system, you will not like GNU, but that's tough on you. If your business is something else, GNU can save you from being pushed into the expensive business of selling operating systems.

I would like to see GNU development supported by gifts from many manufacturers and users, reducing the cost to each.(6)

"Don't programmers deserve a reward for their creativity?"

If anything deserves a reward, it is social contribution. Creativity can be a social contribution, but only in so far as society is free to use the results. If programmers deserve to be rewarded for creating innovative programs, by the same token they deserve to be punished if they restrict the use of these programs.

"Shouldn't a programmer be able to ask for a reward for his creativity?"

There is nothing wrong with wanting pay for work, or seeking to maximize one's income, as long as one does not use means that are destructive. But the means customary in the field of software today are based on destruction.

Extracting money from users of a program by restricting their use of it is destructive because the restrictions reduce the amount and the ways that the

program can be used. This reduces the amount of wealth that humanity derives from the program. When there is a deliberate choice to restrict, the harmful consequences are deliberate destruction.

The reason a good citizen does not use such destructive means to become wealthier is that, if everyone did so, we would all become poorer from the mutual destructiveness. This is Kantian ethics; or, the Golden Rule. Since I do not like the consequences that result if everyone hoards information, I am required to consider it wrong for one to do so. Specifically, the desire to be rewarded for one's creativity does not justify depriving the world in general of all or part of that creativity.

"Won't programmers starve?"

I could answer that nobody is forced to be a programmer. Most of us cannot manage to get any money for standing on the street and making faces. But we are not, as a result, condemned to spend our lives standing on the street making faces, and starving. We do something else.

But that is the wrong answer because it accepts the questioner's implicit assumption: that without ownership of software, programmers cannot possibly be paid a cent. Supposedly it is all or nothing.

The real reason programmers will not starve is that it will still be possible for them to get paid for programming; just not paid as much as now.

Restricting copying is not the only basis for business in software. It is the most common basis(7) because it brings in the most money. If it were prohibited, or

rejected by the customer, software business would move to other bases of organization which are now used less often. There are always numerous ways to organize any kind of business.

Probably programming will not be as lucrative on the new basis as it is now. But that is not an argument against the change. It is not considered an injustice that sales clerks make the salaries that they now do. If programmers made the same, that would not be an injustice either. (In practice they would still make considerably more than that.)

"Don't people have a right to control how their creativity is used?"

"Control over the use of one's ideas" really constitutes control over other people's lives; and it is usually used to make their lives more difficult.

People who have studied the issue of intellectual property rights(8) carefully (such as lawyers) say that there is no intrinsic right to intellectual property. The kinds of supposed intellectual property rights that the government recognizes were created by specific acts of legislation for specific purposes.

For example, the patent system was established to encourage inventors to disclose the details of their inventions. Its purpose was to help society rather than to help inventors. At the time, the life span of 17 years for a patent was short compared with the rate of advance of the state of the art. Since patents are an issue only among manufacturers, for whom the cost and effort of a license agreement are small compared with setting up production, the patents often do not do much harm. They do not obstruct

most individuals who use patented products.

The idea of copyright did not exist in ancient times, when authors frequently copied other authors at length in works of nonfiction. This practice was useful, and is the only way many authors' works have survived even in part. The copyright system was created expressly for the purpose of encouraging authorship. In the domain for which it was invented—books, which could be copied economically only on a printing press—it did little harm, and did not obstruct most of the individuals who read the books.

All intellectual property rights are just licenses granted by society because it was thought, rightly or wrongly, that society as a whole would benefit by granting them. But in any particular situation, we have to ask: are we really better off granting such license? What kind of act are we licensing a person to do?

The case of programs today is very different from that of books a hundred years ago. The fact that the easiest way to copy a program is from one neighbor to another, the fact that a program has both source code and object code which are distinct, and the fact that a program is used rather than read and enjoyed, combine to create a situation in which a person who enforces a copyright is harming society as a whole both materially and spiritually; in which a person should not do so regardless of whether the law enables him to.

"Competition makes things get done better."

The paradigm of competition is a race: by rewarding the winner, we encourage everyone to run faster. When capitalism really works this way, it does a good

job; but its defenders are wrong in assuming it always works this way. If the runners forget why the reward is offered and become intent on winning, no matter how, they may find other strategies—such as, attacking other runners. If the runners get into a fist fight, they will all finish late.

Proprietary and secret software is the moral equivalent of runners in a fist fight. Sad to say, the only referee we've got does not seem to object to fights; he just regulates them ("For every ten yards you run, you can fire one shot"). He really ought to break them up, and penalize runners for even trying to fight.

"Won't everyone stop programming without a monetary incentive?"

Actually, many people will program with absolutely no monetary incentive. Programming has an irresistible fascination for some people, usually the people who are best at it. There is no shortage of professional musicians who keep at it even though they have no hope of making a living that way.

But really this question, though commonly asked, is not appropriate to the situation. Pay for programmers will not disappear, only become less. So the right question is, will anyone program with a reduced monetary incentive? My experience shows that they will.

For more than ten years, many of the world's best programmers worked at the Artificial Intelligence Lab for far less money than they could have had anywhere else. They got many kinds of nonmonetary rewards: fame and appreciation, for example. And

creativity is also fun, a reward in itself.

Then most of them left when offered a chance to do the same interesting work for a lot of money.

What the facts show is that people will program for reasons other than riches; but if given a chance to make a lot of money as well, they will come to expect and demand it. Low-paying organizations do poorly in competition with high-paying ones, but they do not have to do badly if the high-paying ones are banned.

"We need the programmers desperately. If they demand that we stop helping our neighbors, we have to obey."

You're never so desperate that you have to obey this sort of demand. Remember: millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute!

"Programmers need to make a living somehow."

In the short run, this is true. However, there are plenty of ways that programmers could make a living without selling the right to use a program. This way is customary now because it brings programmers and businessmen the most money, not because it is the only way to make a living. It is easy to find other ways if you want to find them. Here are a number of examples.

A manufacturer introducing a new computer will pay for the porting of operating systems onto the new hardware.

The sale of teaching, handholding and maintenance services could also employ programmers.

People with new ideas could distribute programs as freeware(9), asking for donations from satisfied users, or selling handholding services. I have met people who are already working this way successfully.

Users with related needs can form users' groups, and pay dues. A group would contract with programming companies to write programs that the group's members would like to use.

All sorts of development can be funded with a Software Tax:

Suppose everyone who buys a computer has to pay x percent of the price as a software tax. The government gives this to an agency like the NSF to spend on software development.

But if the computer buyer makes a donation to software development himself, he can take a credit against the tax. He can donate to the project of his own choosing—often, chosen because he hopes to use the results when it is done. He can take a credit for any amount of donation up to the total tax he had to pay.

The total tax rate could be decided by a vote of the payers of the tax, weighted according to the amount they will be taxed on.

The consequences:

- The computer-using community supports software development.
- This community decides what level of support is needed.

- Users who care which projects their share is spent on can choose this for themselves.

In the long run, making programs free is a step toward the postscarcity world, where nobody will have to work very hard just to make a living. People will be free to devote themselves to activities that are fun, such as programming, after spending the necessary ten hours a week on required tasks such as legislation, family counseling, robot repair and asteroid prospecting. There will be no need to be able to make a living from programming.

We have already greatly reduced the amount of work that the whole society must do for its actual productivity, but only a little of this has translated itself into leisure for workers because much nonproductive activity is required to accompany productive activity. The main causes of this are bureaucracy and isometric struggles against competition. Free software will greatly reduce these drains in the area of software production. We must do this, in order for technical gains in productivity to translate into less work for us.

Footnotes

1. The wording here was careless. The intention was that nobody would have to pay for permission to use the GNU system. But the words don't make this clear, and people often interpret them as saying that copies of GNU should always be distributed at little or no charge. That was never the intent; later on, the

manifesto mentions the possibility of companies providing the service of distribution for a profit. Subsequently I have learned to distinguish carefully between "free" in the sense of freedom and "free" in the sense of price. Free software is software that users have the freedom to distribute and change. Some users may obtain copies at no charge, while others pay to obtain copies—and if the funds help support improving the software, so much the better. The important thing is that everyone who has a copy has the freedom to cooperate with others in using it.

2. The expression "give away" is another indication that I had not yet clearly separated the issue of price from that of freedom. We now recommend avoiding this expression when talking about free software. See "Confusing Words and Phrases" for more explanation.

3. This is another place I failed to distinguish carefully between the two different meanings of "free". The statement as it stands is not false—you can get copies of GNU software at no charge, from your friends or over the net. But it does suggest the wrong idea.

4. Several such companies now exist.

5. Although it is a charity rather than a company, the Free Software Foundation for 10 years raised most of its funds from its distribution service. You can order things from the FSF to support its work.

6. A group of computer companies pooled funds around 1991 to support maintenance of the GNU C Compiler.

7. I think I was mistaken in saying that proprietary software was the most common basis for making money in software. It seems that actually the most common business model was and is development of custom software. That does not offer the possibility of collecting rents, so the business has to keep doing real work in order to keep getting income. The custom software business would continue to exist, more or less unchanged, in a free software world. Therefore, I no longer expect that most paid programmers would earn less in a free software world.

8. In the 1980s I had not yet realized how confusing it was to speak of "the issue" of "intellectual property". That term is obviously biased; more subtle is the fact that it lumps together various disparate laws which raise very different issues. Nowadays I urge people to reject the term "intellectual property" entirely, lest it lead others to suppose that those laws form one coherent issue. The way to be clear is to discuss patents, copyrights, and trademarks separately. See further explanation of how this term spreads confusion and bias.

9. Subsequently we learned to distinguish between "free software" and "freeware". The term "freeware" means software you are free to redistribute, but usually you are not free to study and change the source code, so most of it is not free software. See "Confusing Words and Phrases" for more explanation.

Source: https://www.gnu.org/gnu/manifesto.html

The Hacker's Manifesto

By The Mentor (a.k.a. Loyd Blankenship)

Another one got caught today, it's all over the papers. "Teenager Arrested in Computer Crime Scandal", "Hacker Arrested after Bank Tampering"…

Damn kids. They're all alike.

But did you, in your three-piece psychology and 1950's technobrain ever take a look behind the eyes of the Hacker? Did you ever wonder what made him tick, what forces shaped him, what may have molded him?

I am a Hacker, enter my world….

Mine is a world that begins with school… I'm smarter than most of the other kids, this crap they teach us bores me…

Damn underachiever. They're all alike.

I made a discovery today. I found a comuputer. Wait a second, this is cool. It does what I want it to. If it makes a mistake it's because I screwed it up. Not because it doesn't like me…
Or feels threatened by me…
Or thinks I'm a smart ass…
Or doesn't like teaching and shouldn't be here…

Damn kid. All he does is play games. They're all alike.

And then it happened… a door opened to a world… rushing through the phone line like heroin through an addict's veins, an electronic pulse is sent out, a refuge from the day-to-day incompetencys is sought… a bored is found.

"This is it… this is where I belong…"
I know everyone here… even if I've never met them,
never talked to them, may never hear from them
again… I know you all…

Damn kid. Tying up the phone line again. They're all
alike…

You bet your ass we're all alike… we've been
spoon-fed baby food at school when we hungered for
steak… the bits of meat that you did let slip were
pre-chewed and tasteless. We've been dominated by
sadists, or ignored by the apathetic. The few that had
somthing to teach found us willing pupils, but those
few are like drops of water in the desert.

This is our world now… the world of the electron and
the switch, the beauty of the baud. We make use of
the service already existing without paying for what
could be dirt-cheap if it wasn't run by profiteering
gluttons, and you call us criminals. We explore… and
you call us criminals. We seek after knowledge, and
you call us criminals. We exist without skin color,
without nationality, without religous bias… and you
call us criminals.
You build atomic bombs, you wage wars, you murder,
cheat, and lie to us and try to make us believe it's for
our own good, yet we're the criminals.

Yes, I am a crimial. My crime is that of curiosity. My
crime is that of judging people by what they say and
think, not what they look like. My crime is that of
outsmarting you, something you will never forgive me
for.

I am a Hacker, and this is my manifesto. You may
stop this individual, but you can't stop us all. After

all… we're all alike.

Manifesto for the Unstable Media

We strive for constant change; for mobility.

We make use of the unstable media, that is, all media which make use of electronic waves and frequencies, such as engines, sound, light, video, computers, and so on. Instability is inherent to these media.

Quantum mechanics has proved, among other things, that the smallest elementary particles, such as electrons, exist in ever-changing forms. They have no stable form, but are characterized by dynamic mobility. This unstable, mobile form of the electron is the basis of the unstable media.

The unstable media are the media of our time. They are the showpieces in our modern homes. We promote their comprehensive use, instead of the often practiced misuse of these media.

We love instability and chaos, because they stand for progress. We do not see chaos as survival of the fittest, but as an order which is composed of countless fragmentary orders, which differ among themselves and within which the prevailing status quo is only a short orientation point.

The unstable media move within the concepts of 'movement-time-space', which implies the possibility of combining more forms and contents within one piece of work. The unstable media reflect our pluriform world.

Unstable media are characterized by dynamic motion and changeability, this in contrast with the world of art which reaches us through the publicity media.

This has come to a standstill and has become a budget for collectors, officials, historians and critics.

ART MUST BE DESTRUCTIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE.

The Manifesto for the Unstable Media was issued by V2_Organisation in 's-Hertogenbosch (Netherlands) in 1987. At the time, V2_ began transforming itself from an multi-media organisation into a centre for media technology. The Manifesto laid down the theoretical principles of V2_, also known since that time, as the Institute for the Unstable Media. Though an historical document, most of what is in the Manifesto is still crucial for the work of the organisation. One way or the other, it would need continuous updating, being, as it should be, unstable.

Source:
https://web.archive.org/web/20000619222100/http://www.v2.nl/browse/v2/manifesto.html

A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace

by John Perry Barlow

Governments of the Industrial World, you weary giants of flesh and steel, I come from Cyberspace, the new home of Mind. On behalf of the future, I ask you of the past to leave us alone. You are not welcome among us. You have no sovereignty where we gather.

We have no elected government, nor are we likely to have one, so I address you with no greater authority than that with which liberty itself always speaks. I declare the global social space we are building to be naturally independent of the tyrannies you seek to impose on us. You have no moral right to rule us nor do you possess any methods of enforcement we have true reason to fear.

Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. You have neither solicited nor received ours. We did not invite you. You do not know us, nor do you know our world. Cyberspace does not lie within your borders. Do not think that you can build it, as though it were a public construction project. You cannot. It is an act of nature and it grows itself through our collective actions.

You have not engaged in our great and gathering conversation, nor did you create the wealth of our marketplaces. You do not know our culture, our ethics, or the unwritten codes that already provide our society more order than could be obtained by any of your impositions.

You claim there are problems among us that you need to solve. You use this claim as an excuse to invade our precincts. Many of these problems don't exist. Where there are real conflicts, where there are wrongs, we will identify them and address them by our means. We are forming our own Social Contract. This governance will arise according to the conditions of our world, not yours. Our world is different.

Cyberspace consists of transactions, relationships, and thought itself, arrayed like a standing wave in the web of our communications. Ours is a world that is both everywhere and nowhere, but it is not where bodies live.

We are creating a world that all may enter without privilege or prejudice accorded by race, economic power, military force, or station of birth.

We are creating a world where anyone, anywhere may express his or her beliefs, no matter how singular, without fear of being coerced into silence or conformity.

Your legal concepts of property, expression, identity, movement, and context do not apply to us. They are all based on matter, and there is no matter here.

Our identities have no bodies, so, unlike you, we cannot obtain order by physical coercion. We believe that from ethics, enlightened self-interest, and the commonweal, our governance will emerge. Our identities may be distributed across many of your jurisdictions. The only law that all our constituent cultures would generally recognize is the Golden Rule. We hope we will be able to build our particular solutions on that basis. But we cannot accept the

solutions you are attempting to impose.

In the United States, you have today created a law, the Telecommunications Reform Act, which repudiates your own Constitution and insults the dreams of Jefferson, Washington, Mill, Madison, DeToqueville, and Brandeis. These dreams must now be born anew in us.

You are terrified of your own children, since they are natives in a world where you will always be immigrants. Because you fear them, you entrust your bureaucracies with the parental responsibilities you are too cowardly to confront yourselves. In our world, all the sentiments and expressions of humanity, from the debasing to the angelic, are parts of a seamless whole, the global conversation of bits. We cannot separate the air that chokes from the air upon which wings beat.

In China, Germany, France, Russia, Singapore, Italy and the United States, you are trying to ward off the virus of liberty by erecting guard posts at the frontiers of Cyberspace. These may keep out the contagion for a small time, but they will not work in a world that will soon be blanketed in bit-bearing media.

Your increasingly obsolete information industries would perpetuate themselves by proposing laws, in America and elsewhere, that claim to own speech itself throughout the world. These laws would declare ideas to be another industrial product, no more noble than pig iron. In our world, whatever the human mind may create can be reproduced and distributed infinitely at no cost. The global conveyance of thought no longer requires your factories to accomplish.

These increasingly hostile and colonial measures place us in the same position as those previous lovers of freedom and self-determination who had to reject the authorities of distant, uninformed powers. We must declare our virtual selves immune to your sovereignty, even as we continue to consent to your rule over our bodies. We will spread ourselves across the Planet so that no one can arrest our thoughts.

We will create a civilization of the Mind in Cyberspace. May it be more humane and fair than the world your governments have made before.

Davos, Switzerland

February 8, 1996

Manifeste du Web indépendant

Le Web indépendant, ce sont ces millions de sites offrant des millions de pages faites de passion, d'opinion, d'information, mises en place par des utilisateurs conscients de leur rôle de citoyens. Le Web indépendant, c'est un lien nouveau entre les individus, une bourse du savoir gratuite, offerte, ouverte ; sans prétention.

Face aux sites commerciaux aux messages publicitaires agressifs, destinés à ficher et cibler les utilisateurs, le Web indépendant propose une vision respectueuse des individus et de leurs libertés, il invite à la réflexion et au dialogue. Quand les sites d'entreprises se transforment en magazines d'information et de divertissement, quand les mastodontes de l'info-spectacle, des télécommunications, de l'informatique et de l'armement investissent le réseau, le Web indépendant propose une vision libre du monde, permet de contourner la censure économique de l'information, sa confusion avec la publicité et le publi-reportage, sa réduction à un spectacle abrutissant et manipulateur.

Pourtant le Web indépendant et contributif est menacé ; menacé par la fuite en avant technologique qui rend la création de sites de plus en plus complexe et chère, par l'écrasante puissance publicitaire du Web marchand, et bientôt par les accès dissymétriques, les Network Computers, les réseaux privés, le broadcasting, destinés à cantonner le citoyen au seul rôle de consommateur. Déjà la presse spécialisée, si avide des publicités d'annonceurs qui récupèrent à

leur profit la formidable richesse du Web contributif, et fascinée par les enjeux techniques et commerciaux de l'Internet, réserve quelques maigres lignes aux sites indépendants, occulte l'enjeu culturel du réseau, expédie rapidement la mort des sites pionniers du Web artisanal, quand elle glose en long et en large sur le nouveau site de tel vendeur de soupe. La création d'un site personnel y est présentée aux utilisateurs comme une motivation très annexe, loin derrière les possibilités d'utilisation en ligne de sa carte de crédit.

Nous invitons donc les utilisateurs à prendre conscience de leur rôle primordial sur l'Internet : lorsqu'ils montent leur propre site, lorsqu'ils envoient des commentaires, critiques et encouragements aux webmestres, lorsqu'ils s'entraident dans les forums et par courrier électronique, ils offrent une information libre et gratuite que d'autres voudraient vendre et contrôler. La pédagogie, l'information, la culture et le débat d'opinion sont le seul fait des utilisateurs, des webmestres indépendants et des initiatives universitaires et associatives.

dimanche 2 février 1997
par le minirézo

Hackerethik

Chaos Computer Club e.V.

- Der Zugang zu Computern und allem, was einem zeigen kann, wie diese Welt funktioniert, sollte unbegrenzt und vollständig sein.
- Alle Informationen müssen frei sein.
- Mißtraue Autoritäten - fördere Dezentralisierung
- Beurteile einen Hacker nach dem, was er tut und nicht nach üblichen Kriterien wie Aussehen, Alter, Rasse, Geschlecht oder gesellschaftlicher Stellung.
- Man kann mit einem Computer Kunst und Schönheit schaffen.
- Computer können dein Leben zum Besseren verändern
- Mülle nicht in den Daten anderer Leute
- Öffentliche Daten nützen, private Daten schützen

Die Hackerethik ist nur bedingt einheitlich definiert. Es gibt eine ursprüngliche Version aus dem Buch "Hackers" von Steven Levy (ISBN 0-440-13405-6). Unstrittig ist insofern, daß die ursprüngliche Version aus dem MIT-Eisenbahnerclub (Tech Model Railroad Club) kommt und insofern aus einer Zeit stammt, in der sich verhältnissmäßig viele Leute wenige Computer teilen mußten und entsprechende Überlegungen zum Umgang miteinander und der Materie sinnvoll waren.

Die letzten beiden Punkte sind Ergänzungen des CCC aus den 80er Jahren. Nachdem einige mehr oder

weniger durchgeknallte aus der Hackerszene bzw. aus dem Umfeld auf die Idee kamen, ihr "Hack-Knowhow" dem KGB anzubieten, gab es heftige Diskussionen, weil Geheimdienste eher konträr zur Förderung freier Information stehen. Aber auch Eingriffe in die Systeme fremder Betreiber wurden zunehmend als kontraproduktiv erkannt.

Um den Schutz der Privatsphäre des einzelnen mit der Förderung von Informationsfreiheit für Informationen, die die Öffentlichkeit betreffen, zu verbinden, wurde schließlich der bislang letzte Punkt angefügt.

Die Hackerethik befindet sich - genauso wie die übrige Welt - insofern in ständiger Weiterentwicklung und Diskussion.

Im Rahmen des 15. Chaos Communication Congress (27.-29.12.1998) fand ein Workshop statt, der noch andere Aspekte hervorgebracht hat, die bisher noch nicht eingearbeitet wurden. Das dort diskutierte Modell teilt sich in die Kategorien "Glaube" und "Moral", das ja bereits in der Kirche einige Jahrhunderte erfolgreich praktiziert wurde. Glaube (z.B. an eine Verbesserung der Lage durch Förderung von Informationsfreiheit und Transparenz) steht - wie auch in der Kirche - vor Moral (z.B. an den Regeln, mit fremden Systemen sorgsam umzugehen). Bevor wir jetzt allerdings anstreben, eine Kirche zu werden und dann auch gleich konsequenter Ablasshandel u.ä. zu betreiben, überlegen wir uns das nochmal gründlich. Dabei dürfen natürlich alle mitdenken.

Bis dahin stehen die o.g. Regeln als Diskussionsgrundlage und Orientierung.

Verbesserungsvorschläge und Eingaben dazu gerne
jederzeit an den Chaos Computer Club

Quelle:
https://web.archive.org/web/20011227211029/http:
//www.ccc.de/hackerethics

Part II

2000 - 2009

The Hacktivismo Declaration

assertions of liberty
in support of an uncensored internet

DEEPLY ALARMED that state-sponsored censorship of the Internet is rapidly spreading with the assistance of transnational corporations,

TAKING AS A BASIS the principles and purposes enshrined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) that states, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers", and Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) that says,

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.
3. The exercise of the rights provided for in paragraph 2 of this article carries with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall only be such as are provided by law and are necessary:

    a. For respect of the rights or reputations of others;

b. For the protection of national security or of public order, or of public health or morals.

RECALLING that some member states of the United Nations have signed the ICCPR, or have ratified it in such a way as to prevent their citizens from using it in courts of law,

CONSIDERING that, such member states continue to willfully suppress wide-ranging access to lawfully published information on the Internet, despite the clear language of the ICCPR that freedom of expression exists in all media,

TAKING NOTE that transnational corporations continue to sell information technologies to the world's most repressive regimes knowing full well that they will be used to track and control an already harried citizenry,

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT that the Internet is fast becoming a method of repression rather than an instrument of liberation,

BEARING IN MIND that in some countries it is a crime to demand the right to access lawfully published information, and of other basic human rights,

RECALLING that member states of the United Nations have failed to press the world's most egregious information rights violators to a higher standard,

MINDFUL that denying access to information could lead to spiritual, intellectual, and economic decline, the promotion of xenophobia and destabilization of international order,

CONCERNED that governments and transnationals are colluding to maintain the status quo,

DEEPLY ALARMED that world leaders have failed to address information rights issues directly and without equivocation,

RECOGNIZING the importance to fight against human rights abuses with respect to reasonable access to information on the Internet,

THEREFORE WE ARE CONVINCED that the international hacking community has a moral imperative to act, and we

DECLARE:

That full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms includes the liberty of fair and reasonable access to information, whether by shortwave radio, air mail, simple telephony, the global internet, or other media.

That we recognize the right of governments to forbid the publication of properly categorized state secrets, child pornography, and matters related to personal privacy and privilege, among other accepted restrictions. but we oppose the use of state power to control access to the works of critics, intellectuals, artists, or religious figures.

That state sponsored censorship of the internet erodes peaceful and civilized coexistence, affects the exercise of democracy, and endangers the socioeconomic development of nations.

That state-sponsored censorship of the internet is a serious form of organized and systematic violence

against citizens, is intended to generate confusion and xenophobia, and is a reprehensible violation of trust.

That we will study ways and means of circumventing state sponsored censorship of the internet and will implement technologies to challenge information rights violations.

Issued July 4, 2001 by Hacktivismo and the CULT OF THE DEAD COW.

Zero Dollar Laptop Manifesto

by James Wallbank

The zero dollar laptop is widely available to individuals in the developed world. It's also available to businesses, governmental organisations and NGOs. It's also available in the developing world. Distribution is ramping up.

The zero dollar laptop comes in a variety of specifications.

The current typical specification of the zero dollar laptop in the UK is around 500mHz, with 256mB RAM, a 10 gigabyte hard disk, a network card, a CD-ROM, a USB port and a screen capable of displaying at least 800x600 pixels in 16-bit colour. Many zero dollar laptops are better specified. (Its close cousin, the zero dollar desktop, typically runs at 1000mHz or faster.)

The zero dollar laptop is constantly being upgraded - so by next year its specification will be even more powerful.

The zero dollar laptop is powered with free, open source software. Users can get involved as deeply as they want - the software packages available include easy to use graphical applications, more complex professional applications, and expert level programming languages.

Free software upgrades for the zero dollar laptop are constantly being made available, from a huge variety of software producers.

The zero dollar laptop is not intended simply for multimedia entertainment. Though it can an

educational playground, it can also be a genuinely useful production platform.

The zero dollar laptop allows kids to learn and adults to produce. (Only when people are able to use computers to produce their own data does information communication technology become genuinely empowering.)

The zero dollar laptop has already been distributed. (You weren't told about it at the time of distribution.)

Individuals, businesses and non-profit organisations can all have a say in how the zero dollar laptop is rolled out in their local area. It's not up to government think-tanks, multinational NGOs or national policy boards.

The zero dollar laptop is available to individuals, education organisations, NGOs and businesses alike.

The carbon footprint of the zero dollar laptop is zero.

You, as an individual, may already own a zero dollar laptop.

What's it doing? Sitting on your shelf, unused, because you've already upgraded?

Your employer or your school may own a large number of zero dollar laptops.

What are they doing? Are they getting recycled responsibly (i.e. destroyed) by the company that supplied them? (That's often the company that just happens to be supplying the next generation of laptops.)

Perhaps surprisingly, you may not know how to install or operate the zero dollar laptop.

You may never have installed a free, open source operating system. You may never have installed any operating system.

Nowadays it's quite easy. You can download a full version of the Linux operating system appropriate for the specification of your zero dollar laptop for free. It's entirely legal.

Many versions of Linux are user-friendly. There are lots of help resources online, and there are likely to be local people who'll be happy to give you advice.

You may be unaware of lightweight window-managers that use memory more efficiently. You may never have used powerful, compatible free office and productivity software. It may surprise you to discover that free software can be better than software you can buy.

You may be reluctant to invest time, of which you may only have a little, rather than invest money - of which you may have plenty.

Think about the longer-term consequences: buy software and you'll have to pay again and again. Invest time learning about free software, and you'll never have to pay for software again.

For the sake of the planet, and for the sake of a fair, just, and cohesive society, isn't it about time you learned? Then maybe you could teach someone else.

You may ask, "Why isn't someone doing something to roll out the zero dollar laptop?" In developed-world economies and cultures we're familiar with centralised solutions. We're less familiar with localised,

decentralised, do-it-yourself solutions. In this case, that "someone" is you.

Decentralised solutions like the zero dollar laptop may not seem to be as efficient as centralised solutions. However, efficiency isn't everything. Solutions of this character are more robust, more responsive to local circumstances, greener, more flexible, and they encourage local skill development and independence.

You may have to spend unpaid time learning about and implementing the distribution of a few zero dollar laptops in your area. Think about the contacts you'll make and the skills you'll learn. Think about the skills you'll help to develop, the lives you may transform, the fun you'll have.

The emergence of the zero dollar laptop as a key computing platform for empowering individuals, stimulating creativity, overcoming poverty and enriching our shared culture is entirely feasible without any additional research, design, or manufacture.

We already have all the tools we need - all we need to manufacture is the will to act locally; all we need to replace is the software on our hard drives; all we need to develop is the content of our minds.

Source: https: //jaromil.dyne.org/journal/zero_dollar_laptop.html

Manifesto for Agile Software Development

We are uncovering better ways of developing software by doing it and helping others do it.

Through this work we have come to value:

- **Individuals and interactions** over processes and tools
- **Working software** over comprehensive documentation
- **Customer collaboration** over contract negotiation
- **Responding to change** over following a plan

That is, while there is value in the items on the right, we value the items on the left more.

Principles behind the Agile Manifesto

We follow these principles:

1. Our highest priority is to satisfy the customer through early and continuous delivery of valuable software.
2. Welcome changing requirements, even late in development. Agile processes harness change for the customer's competitive advantage.
3. Deliver working software frequently, from a couple of weeks to a couple of months, with a preference to the shorter timescale.

4. Business people and developers must work together daily throughout the project.

5. Build projects around motivated individuals. Give them the environment and support they need, and trust them to get the job done.

6. The most efficient and effective method of conveying information to and within a development team is face-to-face conversation.

7. Working software is the primary measure of progress.

8. Agile processes promote sustainable development. The sponsors, developers, and users should be able to maintain a constant pace indefinitely.

9. Continuous attention to technical excellence and good design enhances agility.

10. Simplicity–the art of maximizing the amount of work not done–is essential.

11. The best architectures, requirements, and designs emerge from self-organizing teams.

12. At regular intervals, the team reflects on how to become more effective, then tunes and adjusts its behavior accordingly.

Authors

Kent Beck
Mike Beedle
Arie van Bennekum
Alistair Cockburn
Ward Cunningham
Martin Fowler
James Grenning

Jim Highsmith
Andrew Hunt
Ron Jeffries
Jon Kern
Brian Marick
Robert C. Martin
Steve Mellor
Ken Schwaber
Jeff Sutherland
Dave Thomas

Source:
http://www.agilemanifesto.org/

Mark Shuttleworth's Ubuntu manifesto

Posted by Bill Kerr, June 14 2007

Shuttleworth's Ubuntu philosophy is scattered throughout his blog. I've collected them in one place here.

Big challenges for the Free Software Community

"The real challenge lies ahead - taking free software to the mass market, to your grandparents, to your nieces and nephews, to your friends. This is the next wave, and if we are to be successful we need to articulate the audacious goals clearly and loudly - because that's how the community process works best"

#13: "Pretty" as a feature

"If we want the world to embrace free software, we have to make it beautiful…"

#12: Consistent packaging

"… I'd like to see us define distribution-neutral packaging that suits both the source-heads and the distro-heads"

#11: Simplified, rationalised licensing

"I'm absolutely convinced it is free source, not "open" source, which is at the heart of the innovation that will carry free software to ubiquity … But my voice is only one of many, and I recognise in this world that there are lots of reasonable, rational positions which are different but still, for some people, appropriate …

So what can be done? Well, I turn for inspiration to the work of the Creative Commons. They've seen this problem coming a long way off, and realised that it is better to create a clear "licence space" which covers the various permutations and combinations that will come to exist anyway …"

#10: Pervasive presence

"… turning that haphazard process into a systematic framework - making sure that you (well, more accurately your laptop and your cell phone) know how you should reach out and touch the person you want to communicate with. It's about an integrated addressbook - no more distinctions between IM and email …"

#9: Pervasive support

"… why do people say "Linux is not supported"? Because the guy behind the counter at their corner PC-cafe doesn't support it … This is why I encourage governments to announce that some portion of their infrastructure will run on Linux - it catalyses the whole ecosystem to make their existing capacity public …"

#8: Govoritye po Russki

"There are 347 languages with more than a million speakers. But even Ubuntu, which has amazing infrastructure for translation and a great community that actually does the work, is nowhere close to being fully translated in more than 10 or 15 languages"

#007: Great gadgets!

"This world is increasingly defined not so much by the PC, as by the things we use when we are nowhere

near a PC. The music player. The smart phone. The digital camera. GPS devices. And many, perhaps most, of these new devices can and do run Linux …"

#6: Sensory immersion

"What interests me are the ways in which there is cross-over between the virtual world and the real world … there's going to be a need for innovation around the ways we blur the lines between real and virtual worlds"

#5: Real real-time collaboration

"… people who work with word processors and spreadsheets have rights too! And they could benefit dramatically from much better collaboration …"

#4: Plan, execute, DELIVER

"Bugs, feature planning, release management, translation, testing and QA… these are all areas where we need to improve the level of collaboration BETWEEN projects. I think Launchpad is a good start but there's a long way to go before we're in the same position that the competition is in - seamless conversations between all developers"

#3: The Extra Dimension

"…an opportunity to rethink and improve on many areas of user interface at the system and app level which have been stagnant for a decade or more"

#2: Granny's new camera

"… the ends of the spectrum - the power users and the don't-mess-with-my-system users, are already well serviced by Linux … It's the middle crowd - the

guys who have a computer which they personally modify, attach new hardware to, and expect to interact with a variety of gadgets - that struggle. The problem, in a nutshell, is Granny's new camera"

#1: Keeping it FREE

"… create something that we've never had before, which is a completely level software playing field for every young aspiring IT practitioner, and every aspiring entrepreneur. I believe that's how we will really change the world, and how we will deliver the full benefit of the movement started more than two decades ago by Richard Stallman"

Source: http://billkerr2.blogspot.com/2007/06/ mark-shuttleworths-ubuntu-manifesto.html

The Uppsala Declaration

or

European Pirate Parties Declaration of a basic platform for the European Parliamentary Election of 2009

Policy

Copyright

Copyright is well out of touch with today's cultural landscape. It has evolved into an obstacle to creativity, particularly grass roots creativity. We need at least these changes to copyright law:

Copyright is commercial Copyright only regulates commercial activity. (Local law usually defines "commercial activity" in sufficient detail.) Non-commercial activity is never regulated by copyright law.

Sharply reduced monopoly term Copyright is a limited commercial monopoly that expires well within one generation. The exact term is left to the local pirate party.

No media or hardware levies No levies to compensate for copying should be permitted - but we allow for government scholarships or similar, which are not compensation. This way, it's obviously

unilateral, and the copyright lobby doesn't have the implied right to accept or reject.

Parliament writes copyright law, not the lobby
Technical measures that prevent consumers from using culture in ways permitted by law, so-called DRM technologies, are outlawed.

Derivative works always permitted   Instead of having derivative works normally prohibited except in quite fuzzy fair use exceptions, under our copyright, derivative works are always permitted (not covered by the original copyright), with exceptions to this very specifically enumerated in law with minimal room for interpretation (like "direct translations of a book").

Patents

The patent system of today has lost touch with its original intentions, and has developed into something that is harmful to innovation and economic progress in many areas. Pharmaceutical patents raise many ethical concerns, not least in relation to people in developing countries. They are also a driving force behind increasing costs for publicly funded health care systems in the member states.

We demand an initiative for a European study on the economic impact of pharmaceutical patents, compared to other possible systems for financing drug research, and on alternatives to the current system.

Patents on life (including patents on seeds and on genes) and software patents should not be allowed.

Civil Rights

EU and it's member states should adhere to the highest standards of democracy. Therefore such principles as transparent government, speedy and fair trial and freedom of speech should always be respected. In this day and age it is crucial to preserve the legal protection of citizens from arbitrary exercise of authority. The EU has an important role to play in shining a light on violations against civil rights in member states.

A democratic society needs a transparent state and non-transparent citizens. The citizens should be able to freely gather to formulate and express their opinions without fear of government surveillance. To expand this to an information society the right to anonymity in communication must be expanded. Therefore the secrecy of correspondence should encompass all digital communication.

Votes Strategy

It is the collective consensus of the gathered European Leaders that with the scarce resources of a new founded contender party, those resources must be focused on a well identified front bowling pin. Statistical data states that election participation has been on a continual down slope for the past decade and a half for first-time voters, while at the same time, the core support for our issues are in the 18-30 age range. This data is supported by membership demographics. Therefore, the identified key catalyst target group is university students. Previous

experience from elections where Pirate Parties have participated show that we are unusually strong at technical universities; up to ten times the national average. We need to broaden this scope to all universities. Universities are ideal in that they are a concentrated recruiting ground with people who are generally passionate about what they take part in.

Using Sweden as a template for numbers, assuming that these numbers are similar across other European countries with Pirate Parties, there are 300k university students. 100k votes are needed to get into the European Parliament. This means that we would need 33% of the votes of the university students, which is not a realistic number. Therefore, we must regard universities all across Europe as a recruiting ground for activists and ambassadors, who recruit voters in their turn. For example, there are another 125k 18-year-olds not yet in university, but who usually have friends there. There are friends, relatives, and social circles.

In other words, the key is to supply political passion about the issues to young people who would otherwise typically not vote at all, and encourage them to become recruiting ambassadors in their turn. There is no identified difference here between different political issues of ours. To accomplish this, we need to supply these ambassadors with confidence, rhetoric and, where possible, political material to distribute in turn. This is a logistical challenge that needs to be met by each individual European Pirate Party.

EP Strategy

In the European Parliament, it is the party groups that are the key to getting influence. Once elected, we will discuss with the groups that could be of interest, to determine which group is closest to us, and join that group.

Inside the group, we will do our utmost to persuade the other members of the group to join our position on the issues that fall within our political platform. In return, we'll listen to the advice of the group on all other issues, and vote with the group unless we have some strong reasons not to. When we are approached by lobbyists and other parties on issues that are outside the Pirate platform, we will refer them to the relevant person in the group and encourage them to make their case to him. This will allow us to focus on the issues that we really care about. The decision making process in the EU is very complex, and in order to keep on top of what is happening we will need the support of the internet community. The Pirate movement is a grass roots movement that builds on the involvement of many activists working together using modern information technology. This way of working will be a strength that we can use to our benefit once elected.

While working with different issues in the EU, we will keep in mind the principles that we think should be the guiding stars of the EU itself:

Subsidiarity

Decisions should be taken as close to the citizens as possible. The EU should only handle issues that cannot be handled by the individual member states themselves.

Transparency

The decision making process in the EU today works in a way that makes it very difficult for both media and ordinary citizens to follow what is happening and take part in the debate. This has to be improved. We need to work towards more transparency and openness.

Accountability

The European Parliament is the only institution in Brussels that is directly elected by the voters. The role of parliament should be strengthened, so that power is moved out of the back rooms and into the open.

As proposed by the Swedish Piratpartiet on June 29, 2008

Sources: - http://Lists.pirateweb.net/pipermail/pp.internationaLgeneral/2008-June/001195.html - http://wiki.piratenpartei.de/Uppsala-Deklaration - https://archive.org/details/UppsalaDeclaration

Guerilla Open Access Manifesto

Information is power. But like all power, there are those who want to keep it for themselves. The world's entire scientific and cultural heritage, published over centuries in books and journals, is increasingly being digitized and locked up by a handful of private corporations. Want to read the papers featuring the most famous results of the sciences? You'll need to send enormous amounts to publishers like Reed Elsevier.

There are those struggling to change this. The Open Access Movement has fought valiantly to ensure that scientists do not sign their copyrights away but instead ensure their work is published on the Internet, under terms that allow anyone to access it. But even under the best scenarios, their work will only apply to things published in the future. Everything up until now will have been lost.

That is too high a price to pay. Forcing academics to pay money to read the work of their colleagues? Scanning entire libraries but only allowing the folks at Google to read them? Providing scientific articles to those at elite universities in the First World, but not to children in the Global South? It's outrageous and unacceptable.

"I agree," many say, "but what can we do? The companies hold the copyrights, they make enormous amounts of money by charging for access, and it's perfectly legal - there's nothing we can do to stop them." But there is something we can, something that's already being done: we can fight back.

Those with access to these resources - students, librarians, scientists - you have been given a privilege. You get to feed at this banquet of knowledge while the rest of the world is locked out. But you need not - indeed, morally, you cannot - keep this privilege for yourselves. You have a duty to share it with the world. And you have: trading passwords with colleagues, filling download requests for friends.

Meanwhile, those who have been locked out are not standing idly by. You have been sneaking through holes and climbing over fences, liberating the information locked up by the publishers and sharing them with your friends.

But all of this action goes on in the dark, hidden underground. It's called stealing or piracy, as if sharing a wealth of knowledge were the moral equivalent of plundering a ship and murdering its crew. But sharing isn't immoral - it's a moral imperative. Only those blinded by greed would refuse to let a friend make a copy.

Large corporations, of course, are blinded by greed. The laws under which they operate require it - their shareholders would revolt at anything less. And the politicians they have bought off back them, passing laws giving them the exclusive power to decide who can make copies.

There is no justice in following unjust laws. It's time to come into the light and, in the grand tradition of civil disobedience, declare our opposition to this private theft of public culture.

We need to take information, wherever it is stored, make our copies and share them with the world. We

need to take stuff that's out of copyright and add it to the archive. We need to buy secret databases and put them on the Web. We need to download scientific journals and upload them to file sharing networks. We need to fight for Guerilla Open Access.

With enough of us, around the world, we'll not just send a strong message opposing the privatization of knowledge - we'll make it a thing of the past. Will you join us?

Aaron Swartz

July 2008, Eremo, Italy

The Cult of Done Manifesto

Dear Members of the Cult of Done,

I present to you a manifesto of done. This was written in collaboration with Kio Stark in 20 minutes because we only had 20 minutes to get it done.

The Cult of Done Manifesto

1. There are three states of being. Not knowing, action and completion.
2. Accept that everything is a draft. It helps to get it done.
3. There is no editing stage.
4. Pretending you know what you're doing is almost the same as knowing what you are doing, so just accept that you know what you're doing even if you don't and do it.
5. Banish procrastination. If you wait more than a week to get an idea done, abandon it.
6. The point of being done is not to finish but to get other things done.
7. Once you're done you can throw it away.
8. Laugh at perfection. It's boring and keeps you from being done.
9. People without dirty hands are wrong. Doing something makes you right.
10. Failure counts as done. So do mistakes.
11. Destruction is a variant of done.
12. If you have an idea and publish it on the internet, that counts as a ghost of done.
13. Done is the engine of more.

Bre Pettis
March 3, 2009

Piracy Manifesto

News from a future newspaper: *"A man was stopped yesterday at the border of Italy and France, his computer was scanned and pirated material was found, mostly Adobe software and songs by Beatles. The man was arrested at the spot"*

From a poem to a drug, from an piece of software to a music record and from a film to a book, everything that's famous and profitable, owns much of its economic value to the manipulation of the Multitudes. People haven't asked to know what the Coca-Cola logo looks like, neither have they asked for the melody of "Like a Virgin". Education, Media and Propaganda teach all that the hard way; by either hammering it on our brains or by speculating over our thirst, our hunger, our need for communication and fun and most of all, over our loneliness and despair. In the days of Internet, what can be copied can be also shared. When it comes to content, we can give everything to everyone at once.

Around this realization, a new social class is awakening. This is not a working class but a class of Producers. Producers are pirates and hackers by default; they recycle the images, the sounds and the concepts of the World. Some of it they invent but most they borrow from others.

Because information occupies a physical part of our bodies, because it is literary "installed" on our brain and can't be erased at wish, people have the right to own what is projected on them: They have the right to own themselves! Because this is a global World

based on inequality and profit, because the contents
of a song, a movie or a book are points of advantage
in a vicious fight for survival, any global citizen has
the moral right to appropriate a digital copy of a song,
a movie or a book. Because software is an
international language, the secrets of the World are
now written in Adobe and Microsoft: we should try
hack them. Finally, because poverty is the field of
experimentation for all global medicine, no patents
should apply.

Today, every man with a computer is a Producer and
a Pirate. We all live in the Internet, this is our new
country, the only territory that makes sense to defend
and protect . The land of the Internet is one of
information. Men should be able to use this land
freely, corporations should pay for use - a company is
definitely not a person.

Internet is now producing "Internets", situations that
exist not only online but also in real space, governed
by what is happening online. This is the time for the
foundation of an global Movement of Piracy. The
freedom of infringing copyright, the freedom of
sharing information and drugs: these are our new
"Commons". They are Global Rights and as such,
Authorities will not allow them without a battle. But
this will be a strange battle because this is the first
time the Multitudes disrespect the Law instinctively
and on a global scale.

Today, an army of teenagers is copying, the adults
are copying and even the senior citizens, people from
the Left and from the Right are copying. Everyone
with a computer is copying something; like a novel
Goddess Athena, Information wants to break free

from the head of Technology and it assists us on our enterprise.

Pirates of the Internet Unite!

Miltos Manetas, 2009

POwr, Broccoli and Kopimi

/join #kopimi

According to Kopimi all truths can be summarized in one sentence: "The Internet is right."

Though seeded in prehistory, Kopimi is rooted in the future, and holds together a constantly vibrating avalanche of knowledge that forms the foundation for a discussion indifferent to the rippling changes of time and space. A tumult where no one has the permission to keep silent, and where we must speak to everyone and everything.

In attractive flocks, passionate swarms and boisterous schools, we sow ourselves into new contexts and eras. This book is a spontaneously organizing, clustering community project with a single purpose – Kopimi shall be deepening, propagating, and all-consuming. We want to reach further into ourselves and into Kopimi. We want to penetrate further into you, and into the future.

Our words shall, simultaneously, sound as foolishness upon deaf ears and lovely caresses to those who see and hear, but above all: They should bite firmly into you – and your mom. This is a book for those of you who find yourselves in the moment, but are looking for your way forward through the ages.

100 roads to #g-d:

1. Obtain the Internet.

2. Start using IRC.
3. Group and birth a site.
4. Experiment with research chemicals.
5. Design a three-step program.
6. Take a powerful stance for something positive and essential.
7. Regulate nothing.
8. Say that you have to move in two weeks, but stay for seven months. Come back a year later and do it all over again.
9. ROTFLOL.
10. Relax, you're already halfway there.
11. Just kidding.
12. Don't think outside the box. Build a box.
13. Support support.
14. Organize and go to parties and fairs.
15. Start 30–40 blogs about the same things.
16. Drain the private sector of coders, graphic artists and literati.
17. Create a prize that is awarded.
18. Express yourself often in the media, vaguely.
19. Spread all rumors.
20. Seek out and try carding, and travel by expensive trains. Don't order sushi.
21. Start a radio station.
22. Everything you use, you can copy and give an arbitrary name, whether it's a news portal, search engine or public service.
23. Buy a bus.
24. Install a MegaHAL.
25. Make sure that you are really good friends with people who can use Photoshop, HTML,

databases, and the like.

26. Read a shitload of philosophy.
27. Give yourself cult status, and act accordingly.
28. Never aim.
29. Pick on everyone.
30. Invent or misuse Kopimi.
31. Do things together as a composition, not as a collective.
32. Make your advertising confusingly similar to that of established ventures.
33. Always act with intent.
34. Assert, in any context, that the establishment is lagging.
35. When criticized, blame others and refer to the cluster formation's non-linear time-creating swarm hierarchy.
36. Send everything to all media, regardless of niche.
37. Start an anonymous confession venture.
38. Make babies and blog their upbringing.
39. Be sure to closely study and keep abreast with substances.
40. Participate in lively Internet discussions that don't interest you.
41. Start at least three to four IRC channels about every project.
42. Fight and make up often.
43. Share files with anyone who wants them.
44. Deal often with humor sites.
45. Hang out with the Left, the Right, and the Libertarians.
46. See "23" in everything.

47. Flirt with money.
48. Be AFK very little.
49. Threaten large American culture corporations.
50. Broadcast radio from Skäggetorp.
51. Make a "100 list" for successful projects.
52. Be unsure what the list should be named.
53. Take upon yourself a lot of projects.
54. Make sure to be connected to technical, aesthetical, and philosophical people of world class competence.
55. Sleep over at each others houses regularly.
56. Publish a book about Kopimi.
57. At a trial, deny everything.
58. Cultivate unfounded myths and react to them.
59. Hack sites, e-mail accounts, and more.
60. Continuously mock and ridicule all aspects of copyright.
61. Create an Internet site where people can buy and sell votes in democratic elections.
62. Claim to be true, fair and satisfied.
63. Collect money for fraux's trip to Iceland.
64. Confidently claim that all disconnected computers are broken.
65. Do NOT go to Kurdistan.
66. Make sure to thoroughly establish the claim that all hardware is overpriced.
67. Affirm all words and signs.
68. Mindfuck each other to appropriate extent.
69. Take care of small animals.
70. Create and spiritualize the concept of "Snel hest."
71. Start and own a think-tank.

72. Deny magnetism.
73. Start a business school. Drop out.
74. Write press releases often.
75. Use IRC while in your underwear, and eat pizza.
76. Juggle with other people's balls.
77. Ensure that there is no conclusive evidence of Ikko giving monki advertising money by means of volada's helicopter.
78. Cause inflation and a global financial crisis.
79. Express yourself vaguely if anyone asks you, "How much is a bandwidth?"
80. Use "dynamic" to mean "completely out of control".
81. Never mention Hotmail, MSN, or Windows.
82. Have all project meetings on IRC.
83. Claim to receive around 1256 e-mails a day.
84. Force a prosecutor to draw up several thousand pages of drivel.
85. Above all abstract everything.
86. Have a liberal vision of hell.
87. Consider yourself overly qualified for top positions in American film and music industries.
88. Create the world's largest file-sharing service in a twinkling.
89. Attract international attention by accident.
90. Control the portal and opinion makers in all mediums.
91. Standardize and explain your way of doing things at all levels.
92. Have 3576 anonymous confessions on your hard drive. Including the authors' IP addresses and personal information.

93. Preserve the Internet.
94. Mention the Internet as a source in serious discussions.
95. Rarely mention reasons for your IT elitism.
96. Dismiss expressions like "from farm to table" as superstition.
97. Follow the yellow fellow.
98. Skip the last points of your 100 point list.
99. Establish social services as a parody of antisocial services.
100. Start from scratch.
101. Be careful of burning kittens.
102. Write a book, but start with the back cover.
103. Use parables in abundance, preferably about "butter" and "snow".
104. Stop using IRL. Use AFK instead.
105. Cultivate contacts within the powers of state intelligence services.
106. Always define "flat organization" arbitrarily, subjectively, and without common sense.
107. Upload.
108. Take over #g-d.
109. PROFIT.

/clear

In the shadow of the culture industry's final crisis of the 20th-century, grows a larger portrait of the POwr, broccoli and Kopimi. The culture industry's complete failure is followed by the uncanny success of the diffused structure of an Internet elite, spread the world over. The book you're about to read has no

author, no designer, no typesetter, no distribution channel. Nevertheless, you have it in front of you. How did that happen?

Read the frightening instructions of a loosely coherent core of IT specialists grafted into an unsuspecting generation of youths, and how the group stole the eggs, dollars and jpegs in front of the powerless establishment and strong financial interests. Learn how servers, seeders, trackers, e-mail, company formation, foreign investors, Ikko's weekly allowance, scandalous advertisements, links and search services, infiltrated and destroyed an entire world that had nowhere to run, no one to consult, and no one to trust…

The machine, which operates under the radar frequency is unhindered from the Cambodian jungle to the gay neighborhoods of San Francisco, via the empty beaches of Tel-Aviv, and into the Internet of plain folks in Jönköping suburbs and Gothenburg harbor. It leaves no one unmoved and mangles everything in its path. Technically superior and physically independent it's constantly transforming, mutating and reappearing in new guises and under new codenames. With a stranglehold on its opponents it's completely untouched and even more – incomprehensible.

It has rightly been said that this is the first time Kopimi has freed the world and we can be sure that it's not the last.

———————————————

Sources:

https://thepiratebay.se/torrent/4741944/powr.broccoli-kopimi

https://torrentfreak.com/pirate-bay-manifesto-powr-broccoli-and-kopimi-090225/

http://indexofpotential.net/manifesto-of-the-pirate-bay-powr-broccoli-and-kopimi/

http://apas.gr/2010/08/power-broccoli-kopimi-and-the-internets/

Part III

2010 - 2015

The Hardware Hacker Manifesto

My name is Cody and I'm a hardware hacker. It started at the age of five, taking apart a toy computer to figure out how it worked. I live for that thrill of discovery and rush of power that I feel when I figure out what makes something tick, then figure out how to bend it to my will. This has led to me hacking everything from game consoles to phones.

It used to be that this was what people did: if something was wrong with a device, it was acceptable to take it apart, figure out how it worked, and fix whatever was wrong with it. That's no longer the case; we're still there – in growing numbers, to boot – but what's changed is that it's no longer acceptable. As companies have made devices more and more locked down, making hardware hacking even more important than ever, there's a growing segment of the population that believes we're pirates. Who are we to modify these devices against the company's will?

It all comes down to one simple question: once you've purchased something, do you own it? While this may seem like a silly question, it's the entire crux of the argument for hardware hacking. If you believe that the purchaser owns the good, then they have the right to do with it what they want.

I exercise that right on a daily basis, whether with my jailbroken phone, my Wii running homebrew media player software, or – now – my hacked brain-computer interface. The last case is interesting, because it's the first time I've ever been called a pirate by a representative of the company producing

the hardware I hacked:

> Piracy is a vexed question but in its worst
> form it is still basically taking what
> someone has spent a lot of time and
> money on, and denying them some or all
> of the rewards for doing it. If the
> developer is being reasonable about it
> then it's tough to justify piracy. It costs a
> lot to get something developed and into
> the market, and next to nothing to copy
> or crack it. It discourages people from
> taking the risks in the first place, and
> we're all the poorer for the things that
> didn't get done because they would be
> too easy to steal.

In this case, I purchased a brain-computer interface
outright, then proceeded to reverse-engineer it and
release details of how to communicate with it. In the
week since I released this, I've been called a selfish
pirate more than I'd like to recall. All of this because I
decided to exercise my right to use my hardware the
way I want.

Why should we have to ask permission to use what
we've spent our money on? Let's see an absurd
extension of this logic: Why should Ford lose out on
the rewards of building the car, when you don't go to
an authorized service station to get your oil changed?

Let me make this crystal clear: once you sell me
something, I will do whatever I want with it. Period.
I'll take it apart, I'll patch it, I'll make it do things you
never imagined, and I'll tell everyone who will listen

exactly how to do the same. It's mine, and every device you've purchased is yours too; don't let anyone tell you otherwise.

I am a hardware hacker and this is my manifesto. We've always been here and we will always be here; you can fight to keep us out, but we'll fight even harder to get back in. I assure you we'll win.

Happy hacking,
- Cody Brocious (Daeken)

The Bitcoin Manifesto

The Bitcoin Manifesto April 10, 2011, 04:56:35 PM #1
From my friend Jaromil. I love this little speech:

hi Aharon,

On Thu, 07 Apr 2011, a…@aharonic.net wrote:

> bitcoins - isn't this simply a distributed
> structure to do capitalism with?

That's not even the worst you can do with it. you can
do money laundering, buy drugs online and sex toys,
all anonymously. but that's not the point, because
despite the coercion imposed by all kinds of regulatory
systems so far, also current official monetary systems
are full of that shit, on top of the capitalist pie.

Emerging technologies should never be judged by the
sensationally bad taste of early adopters. it's like
being concerned about the shit that fertilizes some
beautiful flowers, wasting their seeds.

What really bitcoin is, I finally understood on the 6
april (which somehow always ends up being a magic
day, eh!): this is now the end of the *flow capitalism*,
which consists of the monopoly on transactions, the
hegemony of banks on the movement of values and
not just their storage, this middle-man mafia
strangling the world as we speak.

How right are now those South American countries
asking the "taxation of transactions", an argument
refrained in many speeches of the companeros. They
studied the system and understood that there is a

crucial problem there, that needs to be solved urgently. Yet i'd argue here taxation on transaction cannot be the solution. The solution is to eliminate the flow capitalists.

If i want to give you money i'll give it to *you*. me and you, period. its fine that we'll pay our taxes for our communities, don't get me wrong this is not a tea bagger argument. its just not right that all what we do is in the hands of a third party, that has been caught cheating already many times: look at what happened at the paypal accounts of the Iraqi linux user group back in 2004, or even more recently to Wikileaks.

We don't need those fat cheaters to be in between our value transactions anymore; the flow capital has played its disgusting role in the little laps of history for which it has been needed, now sadly these people won't give up what they have accumulated, so it makes more sense to leave them alone and multiply more monetary systems that work efficiently across diverse networks and that rely on the neutrality of a cryptographic authentication.

the death of the flow capital is a new stage for the necrotization of capitalism.

ciao

Source:
https://bitcointalk.org/index.php?topic=5671.0

The Critical Engineering Manifesto

0. The Critical Engineer considers Engineering to be the most transformative language of our time, shaping the way we move, communicate and think. It is the work of the Critical Engineer to study and exploit this language, exposing its influence.

1. The Critical Engineer considers any technology depended upon to be both a challenge and a threat. The greater the dependence on a technology the greater the need to study and expose its inner workings, regardless of ownership or legal provision.

2. The Critical Engineer raises awareness that with each technological advance our techno-political literacy is challenged.

3. The Critical Engineer deconstructs and incites suspicion of rich user experiences.

4. The Critical Engineer looks beyond the "awe of implementation" to determine methods of influence and their specific effects.

5. The Critical Engineer recognises that each work of engineering engineers its user, proportional to that user's dependency upon it.

6. The Critical Engineer expands "machine" to describe interrelationships encompassing devices, bodies, agents, forces and networks.

7. The Critical Engineer observes the space between the production and consumption of technology. Acting rapidly to changes in this space, the Critical Engineer serves to expose moments of imbalance and deception.

8. The Critical Engineer looks to the history of art, architecture, activism, philosophy and invention and finds exemplary works of Critical Engineering. Strategies, ideas and agendas from these disciplines will be adopted, re-purposed and deployed.

9. The Critical Engineer notes that written code expands into social and psychological realms, regulating behaviour between people and the machines they interact with. By understanding this, the Critical Engineer seeks to reconstruct user-constraints and social action through means of digital excavation.

10. The Critical Engineer considers the exploit to be the most desirable form of exposure.

The Critical Engineering Working Group
Julian Oliver
Gordan Savičić
Danja Vasiliev
Berlin, October 2011-2014

We, the Web Kids

Piotr Czerski (translated by Marta Szreder)

There is probably no other word that would be as overused in the media discourse as 'generation'. I once tried to count the 'generations' that have been proclaimed in the past ten years, since the well-known article about the so-called 'Generation Nothing'; I believe there were as many as twelve. They all had one thing in common: they only existed on paper. Reality never provided us with a single tangible, meaningful, unforgettable impulse, the common experience of which would forever distinguish us from the previous generations. We had been looking for it, but instead the groundbreaking change came unnoticed, along with cable TV, mobile phones, and, most of all, Internet access. It is only today that we can fully comprehend how much has changed during the past fifteen years.

We, the Web kids; we, who have grown up with the Internet and on the Internet, are a generation who meet the criteria for the term in a somewhat subversive way. We did not experience an impulse from reality, but rather a metamorphosis of the reality itself. What unites us is not a common, limited cultural context, but the belief that the context is self-defined and an effect of free choice.

Writing this, I am aware that I am abusing the pronoun 'we', as our 'we' is fluctuating, discontinuous, blurred, according to old categories: temporary. When I say 'we', it means 'many of us' or 'some of us'. When I say 'we are', it means 'we often are'. I say

'we' only so as to be able to talk about us at all.

1.

We grew up with the Internet and on the Internet. This is what makes us different; this is what makes the crucial, although surprising from your point of view, difference: we do not 'surf' and the internet to us is not a 'place' or 'virtual space'. The Internet to us is not something external to reality but a part of it: an invisible yet constantly present layer intertwined with the physical environment. We do not use the Internet, we live on the Internet and along it. If we were to tell our bildnungsroman to you, the analog, we could say there was a natural Internet aspect to every single experience that has shaped us. We made friends and enemies online, we prepared cribs for tests online, we planned parties and studying sessions online, we fell in love and broke up online. The Web to us is not a technology which we had to learn and which we managed to get a grip of. The Web is a process, happening continuously and continuously transforming before our eyes; with us and through us. Technologies appear and then dissolve in the peripheries, websites are built, they bloom and then pass away, but the Web continues, because we are the Web; we, communicating with one another in a way that comes naturally to us, more intense and more efficient than ever before in the history of mankind.

Brought up on the Web we think differently. The ability to find information is to us something as basic, as the ability to find a railway station or a post office

in an unknown city is to you. When we want to know
something - the first symptoms of chickenpox, the
reasons behind the sinking of 'Estonia', or whether
the water bill is not suspiciously high - we take
measures with the certainty of a driver in a
SatNav-equipped car. We know that we are going to
find the information we need in a lot of places, we
know how to get to those places, we know how to
assess their credibility. We have learned to accept
that instead of one answer we find many different
ones, and out of these we can abstract the most likely
version, disregarding the ones which do not seem
credible. We select, we filter, we remember, and we
are ready to swap the learned information for a new,
better one, when it comes along.

To us, the Web is a sort of shared external memory.
We do not have to remember unnecessary details:
dates, sums, formulas, clauses, street names,
detailed definitions. It is enough for us to have an
abstract, the essence that is needed to process the
information and relate it to others. Should we need
the details, we can look them up within seconds.
Similarly, we do not have to be experts in everything,
because we know where to find people who specialise
in what we ourselves do not know, and whom we can
trust. People who will share their expertise with us
not for profit, but because of our shared belief that
information exists in motion, that it wants to be free,
that we all benefit from the exchange of information.
Every day: studying, working, solving everyday
issues, pursuing interests. We know how to compete
and we like to do it, but our competition, our desire to
be different, is built on knowledge, on the ability to
interpret and process information, and not on

monopolising it.

2.

Participating in cultural life is not something out of ordinary to us: global culture is the fundamental building block of our identity, more important for defining ourselves than traditions, historical narratives, social status, ancestry, or even the language that we use. From the ocean of cultural events we pick the ones that suit us the most; we interact with them, we review them, we save our reviews on websites created for that purpose, which also give us suggestions of other albums, films or games that we might like. Some films, series or videos we watch together with colleagues or with friends from around the world; our appreciation of some is only shared by a small group of people that perhaps we will never meet face to face. This is why we feel that culture is becoming simultaneously global and individual. This is why we need free access to it.

This does not mean that we demand that all products of culture be available to us without charge, although when we create something, we usually just give it back for circulation. We understand that, despite the increasing accessibility of technologies which make the quality of movie or sound files so far reserved for professionals available to everyone, creativity requires effort and investment. We are prepared to pay, but the giant commission that distributors ask for seems to us to be obviously overestimated. Why should we pay for the distribution of information that can be easily and perfectly copied without any loss of

the original quality? If we are only getting the information alone, we want the price to be proportional to it. We are willing to pay more, but then we expect to receive some added value: an interesting packaging, a gadget, a higher quality, the option of watching here and now, without waiting for the file to download. We are capable of showing appreciation and we do want to reward the artist (since money stopped being paper notes and became a string of numbers on the screen, paying has become a somewhat symbolic act of exchange that is supposed to benefit both parties), but the sales goals of corporations are of no interest to us whatsoever. It is not our fault that their business has ceased to make sense in its traditional form, and that instead of accepting the challenge and trying to reach us with something more than we can get for free they have decided to defend their obsolete ways.

One more thing: we do not want to pay for our memories. The films that remind us of our childhood, the music that accompanied us ten years ago: in the external memory network these are simply memories. Remembering them, exchanging them, and developing them is to us something as natural as the memory of 'Casablanca' is to you. We find online the films that we watched as children and we show them to our children, just as you told us the story about the Little Red Riding Hood or Goldilocks. Can you imagine that someone could accuse you of breaking the law in this way? We cannot, either.

3.

We are used to our bills being paid automatically, as long as our account balance allows for it; we know that starting a bank account or changing the mobile network is just the question of filling in a single form online and signing an agreement delivered by a courier; that even a trip to the other side of Europe with a short sightseeing of another city on the way can be organised in two hours. Consequently, being the users of the state, we are increasingly annoyed by its archaic interface. We do not understand why tax act takes several forms to complete, the main of which has more than a hundred questions. We do not understand why we are required to formally confirm moving out of one permanent address to move in to another, as if councils could not communicate with each other without our intervention (not to mention that the necessity to have a permanent address is itself absurd enough.)

There is not a trace in us of that humble acceptance displayed by our parents, who were convinced that administrative issues were of utmost importance and who considered interaction with the state as something to be celebrated. We do not feel that respect, rooted in the distance between the lonely citizen and the majestic heights where the ruling class reside, barely visible through the clouds. Our view of the social structure is different from yours: society is a network, not a hierarchy. We are used to being able to start a dialogue with anyone, be it a professor or a pop star, and we do not need any special qualifications related to social status. The success of the interaction depends solely on whether the content

of our message will be regarded as important and worthy of reply. And if, thanks to cooperation, continuous dispute, defending our arguments against critique, we have a feeling that our opinions on many matters are simply better, why would we not expect a serious dialogue with the government?

We do not feel a religious respect for 'institutions of democracy' in their current form, we do not believe in their axiomatic role, as do those who see 'institutions of democracy' as a monument for and by themselves. We do not need monuments. We need a system that will live up to our expectations, a system that is transparent and proficient. And we have learned that change is possible: that every uncomfortable system can be replaced and is replaced by a new one, one that is more efficient, better suited to our needs, giving more opportunities.

What we value the most is freedom: freedom of speech, freedom of access to information and to culture. We feel that it is thanks to freedom that the Web is what it is, and that it is our duty to protect that freedom. We owe that to next generations, just as much as we owe to protect the environment.

Perhaps we have not yet given it a name, perhaps we are not yet fully aware of it, but I guess what we want is real, genuine democracy. Democracy that, perhaps, is more than is dreamt of in your journalism.

Contact the author: piotr[at]czerski.art.pl

Sources:

http://pastebin.com/0xXV8k7k - by: Czerski, on Feb 15TH, 2012

http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/02/we-the-web-kids/253382/ - posted by Alexis C. Madrigal, Feb 21 2012

Iterative Book Development Manifesto

by Adam Hyde, June 26-27 2012

ok..so i have too much time in my hands…i was pondering the things we do in FLOSS Manuals in abstract and thought we could almost come up kind of short (shudder) manifesto for the kinds of methods we use for book production. I was trying to capture something that could encompass all the activities from Book Sprints to rolling manual development to remote update sprints etc etc etc

so…here it is:

Iterative Book Development (IDB) Manifesto:

We value:

1. **Collaboration and facilitation** over 'editors' and 'authors'
2. **Engaged discourse** over isolation
3. **Completed chunks** over incomplete volumes
4. **Here and now production** over sometime soon production
5. **Meaningful credit** for all contributors

———————————————

Sources:

- http://lists.flossmanuals.net/pipermail/
  discuss-flossmanuals.net/2012-June/007446.
  html
- http://lists.flossmanuals.net/pipermail/
  discuss-flossmanuals.net/2012-June/007465.
  html
- http://blog.booki.cc/2012/06/
  iterative-book-development-manifesto/
- https://web.archive.org/web/
  20131225055321/http://blog.booki.cc/2012/
  06/iterative-book-development-manifesto/

A CryptoParty Manifesto

"Man is least himself when he talks in his own person. Give him a mask, and he will tell you the truth." - Oscar Wilde

In 1996, John Perry Barlow, co-founder of the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF, https://www.eff.org/), wrote 'A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace'. It includes the following passage:

> Cyberspace consists of transactions, relationships, and thought itself, arrayed like a standing wave in the web of our communications. Ours is a world that is both everywhere and nowhere, but it is not where bodies live.

> We are creating a world that all may enter without privilege or prejudice accorded by race, economic power, military force, or station of birth.

> We are creating a world where anyone, anywhere may express his or her beliefs, no matter how singular, without fear of being coerced into silence or conformity.

Sixteen years later, and the Internet has changed the way we live our lives. It has given us the combined knowledge of humankind at our fingertips. We can form new relationships and share our thoughts and

lives with friends worldwide. We can organise, communicate and collaborate in ways never thought possible. This is the world we want to hand down to our children, a world with a free internet.

Unfortunately, not all of John Perry Barlow's vision has come to pass. Without access to online anonymity, we can not be free from privilege or prejudice. Without privacy, free expression is not possible.

The problems we face in the 21st Century require all of humanity to work together. The issues we face are serious: climate change, energy crises, state censorship, mass surveillance and on-going wars. We must be free to communicate and associate without fear. We need to support free and open source projects which aim to increase the commons' knowledge of technologies that we all depend on. [Contribute!]

To realise our right to privacy and anonymity online, we need peer-reviewed, crowd-sourced solutions. CryptoParties provide the opportunity to meet up and learn how to use these solutions to give us all the means with which to assert our right to privacy and anonymity online.

- We are all users, we fight for the user and we strive to empower the user. We assert user requests are the reason why computers exist. We trust in the collective wisdom of human beings, over the interest of software vendors, corporations or governments. We refuse the shackles of digital Gulags, lorded over by vassal interests of governments and corporations. We are the CypherPunk Revolutionaries.

- The right to personal anonymity, pseudonymity and privacy is a basic human right. These rights include life, liberty, dignity, security, right to a family, and the right to live without fear or intimidation. No government, organisation or individual should prevent people from accessing the technology which underscores these basic human rights.

- Privacy is the absolute right of the individual. Transparency is a requirement of governments and corporations who act in the name of the people.

- The individual alone owns the right to their identity. Only the individual may choose what they share. Coercive attempts to gain access to personal information without explicit consent is a breach of human rights.

- All people are entitled to cryptography and the human rights crypto tools afford, regardless of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other op- inion, national or social origin, property, birth, political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory in which a person resides.

- Just as governments should exist only to serve their citizens - so too, cryptography should belong to the people.Technology should not be locked away from the people.

- Surveillance cannot be separated from censorship, and the slavery it entails. No machine shall be held in servitude to surveillance and censorship. Crypto is a key to our collective freedom.

- Code is speech: code is human created language. To ban, censor or lock cryptography away from the people is to deprive human beings from a human right, the freedom of speech.

Those who would seek to stop the spread of cryptography are akin to the XV century clergy seeking to ban the printing press, afraid their monopoly on knowledge will be undermined.

About:

This book was written in the first 3 days of October 2012 at Studio Weise7, Berlin, surrounded by fine food and a lake of coffee amidst a veritable snake pit of cables. Approximately 20 people were involved in its creation, some more than others, some local and some far (Melbourne in particular).

The Book Sprint was 3 days in length and the full list of onsite participants included: Adam Hyde (facilitator), Marta Peirano, Julian Oliver, Danja Vasiliev, Asher Wolf, Jan Gerber, Malte Dik, Brian Newbold, Brendan Howell, AT, Carola Hesse, Chris Pinchen, .. with cover art (illustrations to come) by Emile Denichaud.

Sources: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/slade/know/2969

The European Pirate Party Manifesto

Preamble

We, the European Pirates, want society to welcome and adjust to the digital revolution:

We identify the digital revolution as a moment of total renewal of human societies; we recognise therefore as one of our primary goals the defence of the Internet as a common good and a public utility.

We want a society based on the following manifesto:

Civil Rights

Human dignity is inviolable. Everybody has the right to life, liberty, security of person, freedom of thought, self-determination and participate in society.

We, the European Pirates, support the highest standard for civil rights in the European Union. The rights of free association, freedom of movement and free assembly in public, freedom of opinion, expression, and free access to information are all essential. Whistle-blowers should be protected by law and not subject to legal action.

We strongly believe that all people have the right to fair and equal treatment. As everybody belongs to a minority, it is essential that society respect the rights of minorities.

The Privacy of the individual should be valued at all times and protected from being exploited by public and economic actors.

Citizen participation and Open Government

Power resides with the people. Their rights and their dignity stand above all else.

We, the European Pirates, strive to create opportunities for democratic participation and to promote their widespread use, because only democracy can ensure an equitable balancing of Europeans' diverse interests. Public authorities should be encouraged to put forward participatory and collaborative tools that allow citizens to actively propose policies and make decisions.

Transparency

Transparency and Accountability for public institutions are the counterpart of good data protection regulation to protect Privacy. We, the European Pirates, want clear transparency in common affairs and good privacy for individuals. Public authorities should be required to regularly publish organisational and task descriptions, including catalogues of all administrative records.

Everybody has the right to access documents and proceedings on all levels of government and the information available to the respective public

authorities. The respect of this right shall be controlled by a strictly independent organ.

Copyright reform

We, the European Pirates, want a fair and balanced copyright law based on the interests of society as a whole.

We therefore demand that copying, providing access to, storing and using literary and artistic production for non-commercial purposes must not just be legalised, but protected by law and actively promoted to improve the public availability of information, knowledge and culture, because this is a prerequisite for the social, technological and economic development of our society. Everyone shall be able to enjoy and share our cultural heritage free from the threat of legal action or censorship.

The commercial monopoly given by copyright should be restored to a reasonable term. Derivative works shall always be permitted, with exceptions which are very specifically enumerated in law with minimal room for interpretation.

Patent system reform

Patents are government-backed monopolies which are obstacles in a free market and increasingly hinder, instead of help, innovation. Patents should definitely never be given for things that are trivial, non-substantial, computer programs, business models, or anything unethical.

In the long term, an alternative system to support innovation must be developed to replace patents and ensure that the results of research come to the benefit of society.

Open Access and Open Data

The results of any research carried out with public funds, completely or in part, must be published in open access scientific journals or by other means which make them readily accessible to the general population.

All data created for public use or with the use of public money, regardless of origin, should be freely available to the general public, as long as personal details are not revealed without the consent of the concerned individuals. It shall be made available in an appropriate form, which shall also include a form for data processing. Access must not be limited by application procedures, licenses, fees or technical means.

Net Neutrality

Everybody should have unencumbered access to the internet and other public information and communication networks and have the possibility to protect all data transfer with good privacy. To ensure this we, the European Pirates, advocate for a discrimination-free Internet, which does not permit operators, governments and other bodies to either block or prioritise certain kinds of applications,

services or contents nor limits the access depending on the location of sender or receiver.

Free software and Libre Culture

We, the European Pirates, support the promotion of software that can be used, analysed, disseminated and changed by everyone. This so-called free and libre open source software is essential for users' control of their own technical systems and provides a significant contribution to strengthening the autonomy and privacy of all users.

Free culture is an important resource for the education and creativity of society. We strive to promote artistic activity and cultural diversity to ensure a rich educational and artistic environment for our and future generations.

Notes:

The Manifesto of the European Pirate Party (PPEU) was finalized during a workshop at the conference of PPEU held on 27-28 July 2013 in Warsaw, Poland. The Conference of PPEU in Warsaw, as part of the establishment of the European Pirate Party, was the last of the Conferences that started after the Declaration of Prague nearly one and half year ago. The work has taken place in several other conferences (Barcelona, Manchester, Paris), meetings (Aarau,

Potsdam, Rome, Zagreb, Kiev) and countless online meetings.

Sources:

- http://piratetimes.net/
  here-comes-the-european-pirate-party/ -
  August 18, 2013
- http://ppeu.net/wiki/doku.php?id=statutes:
  manifesto - Last modified: 2013/09/03

A Manifesto for the Truth

By Edward Snowden

In a very short time, the world has learned much about

Such programs are not only a threat to privacy, they also threaten freedom of speech and open societies. The existence of spy technology should not determine policy. We have a moral duty to ensure that our laws and values limit monitoring programs and protect human rights.

Society can only understand and control these problems through an open, respectful and informed debate. At first, some governments feeling embarrassed by the revelations of mass surveillance initiated an unprecedented campaign of persecution to supress this debate. They intimidated journalists and criminalized publishing the truth. At this point, the public was not yet able to evaluate the benefits of the revelations. They relied on their governments to decide correctly.

Today we know that this was a mistake and that such action does not serve the public interest. The debate which they wanted to prevent will now take place in countries around the world. And instead of doing harm, the societal benefits of this new public knowledge is now clear, since reforms are now proposed in the form of increased oversight and new legislation.

Citizens have to fight suppression of information on matters of vital public importance. To tell the truth is not a crime.

This text was written by Edward Snowden on November 1, 2013 in Moscow. It was sent to SPIEGEL staff over an encrypted channel.

Balconism

Text / Constant Dullaart

> A new "-ism" calls for sovereign
> expression in the 21st century, acronyms,
> typos, leetspeak, and kaomoji included.

We are all outside on teh balcony now. Standing on a
platform made out of a tweet into corporate versions
of public space. We are not stored in a cloud, opaque
or translucent to whomever. We publish, we get read.
ok. Private publishing does not exist, we now know
we always get read (hi). To select what we want to
have read, and by whom, is our greatest challenge rly.
For now and teh future. If you tolerate this, your
children will be normalized. Outside, on the street,
status updates in the air, checking into another
spatial analogy of information exchange. Sometimes
hard to reach, through tutorials, encryptions and
principles. It is generous to be outdoors, watched by
a thousand eyes recording us for the future, our
actions to be interpreted as an office job. We need a
private veranda above ground, a place for a breath of
fresh air, out of sight for the casual onlooker, but
great for public announcements. The balcony is both
public and private, online and offline. It is a space
and a movement at the same time. You can be seen
or remain unnoticed, inside and outside. Slippers are
ok on the balcony. Freedom through encryption,
rather than openness. The most important thing is:
you must choose to be seen. We are already seen and
recorded on the streets and in trains, in emailz, chatz,

supermarketz and restaurantz, without a choice.
Remaining unseen, by making a clearer choice where
to be seen. We are in the brave new now, get ready
to choose your balcony, to escape the warm enclosure
of the social web, to address, to talk to the people
outside your algorithm bubble. U will not get arrested
on the balcony, you and yours should have the right
to anonymity on the balcony, although this might
seem technically complicated. The balcony is a
gallery, balustrade, porch and stoop. The balcony is
part of the Ecuadorian embassy. Itz masturbating on
the balcony when your local dictator passes by. AFK,
IRL, BRB and TTYS. The balcony is the Piratebay
memo announcing they will keep up their services by
way of drones, or just Piratbyran completely.
Publishing in a 403, publishing inside the referring
link, and as error on a server. Balconism is IRC, TOR
and OTR. Bal-Kony 2012. Balcony is Speedshows,
online performances, Telecomix, Anonymous, Occupy
and maybe even Google automated cars (def. not
glass tho btw). Balconization, not Balkanization. The
balcony-scene creates community rather than
commodity. Nothing is to be taken seriously. Every
win fails eventually. Proud of web culture, and what
was built with pun, fun, wires, solder, thoughts and
visions of equality. Nothing is sacred on the b4lconi.
It is lit by screens, fueled by open networks, and
strengthened by retweetz. On the balcony the
ambitions are high, identities can be copied, and
reality manipulated. Hope is given and inspiration
created, initiative promoted and development
developed. Know your meme, and meme what you
know. I can haz balcony. Balconism is a soapbox in
the park. The balcony is connected: stand on a

balcony and you will see others. The balcony is connecting: you do not have to be afraid on the balcony, we are behind you, we are the masses, you can feel the warmth from the inside, breathing down your neck. Where privacy ceases to feel private, try to make it private. Ch00se your audience, demand to know to whom you speak if not in public, or know when you are talking to an algorithm. When you can, stay anonymous out of principle, and fun. And when you are in public, understand in which context and at what time you will and could be seen. Speak out on the balcony, free from the storefront, free from the single white space, but leaning into people's offices, bedrooms and coffee tables, leaning into virtually everywhere. On the balcony, contemporary art reclaims its communicative sovereignty through constant reminders of a freedom once had on the internet. Orz to the open internet builders and warriors. Learn how to do, then challenge how it is done. Encrypt. Encrypt well and beautifully. Art with too much theory is called Auditorium, and kitsch is called Living Room. Inspired by home-brew technologies and open network communications, create art in the spirit of the internet, resisting territories, be it institutional and commercial art hierarchies or commercial information hierarchies. The internet is every medium. Head from the information super highway to the balcony that is everywhere through the right VPN. The pool is always closed.

Constant Dullaart is a former resident of the
Rijksakademie in Amsterdam, living and working
mostly in Berlin. His work often deals with the effects
and affects of contemporary communication and mass
media, both online and offline.
http://constantdullaart.com

New Clues

by David Weinberger and Doc Searls

Hear, O Internet.

It has been sixteen years since our previous communication.

In that time the People of the Internet — you and me and all our friends of friends of friends, unto the last Kevin Bacon — have made the Internet an awesome place, filled with wonders and portents.

From the serious to the lolworthy to the wtf, we have up-ended titans, created heroes, and changed the most basic assumptions about How Things Work and Who We Are.

But now all the good work we've done together faces mortal dangers.

When we first came before you, it was to warn of the threat posed by those who did not understand that they did not understand the Internet.

These are The Fools, the businesses that have merely adopted the trappings of the Internet.

Now two more hordes threaten all that we have built for one another.

The Marauders understand the Internet all too well. They view it as theirs to plunder, extracting our data and money from it, thinking that we are the fools.

But most dangerous of all is the third horde: Us.

A horde is an undifferentiated mass of people. But the glory of the Internet is that it lets us connect as diverse and distinct individuals.

We all like mass entertainment. Heck, TV's gotten pretty great these days, and the Net lets us watch it when we want. Terrific.

But we need to remember that delivering mass media is the least of the Net's powers.

The Net's super-power is connection without permission. Its almighty power is that we can make of it whatever we want.

It is therefore not time to lean back and consume the oh-so-tasty junk food created by Fools and Marauders as if our work were done. It is time to breathe in the fire of the Net and transform every institution that would play us for a patsy.

An organ-by-organ body snatch of the Internet is already well underway. Make no mistake: with a stroke of a pen, a covert handshake, or by allowing memes to drown out the cries of the afflicted we can lose the Internet we love.

We come to you from the years of the Web's beginning. We have grown old together on the Internet. Time is short.

We, the People of the Internet, need to remember the glory of its revelation so that we reclaim it now in the name of what it truly is.

Doc Searls
David Weinberger
January 8, 2015

Once were we young in the Garden...

a. The Internet is us, connected.

1. The Internet is not made of copper wire, glass fiber, radio waves, or even tubes.
2. The devices we use to connect to the Internet are not the Internet.
3. Verizon, Comcast, AT&T, Deutsche Telekom, and □□□□ do not own the Internet. Facebook, Google, and Amazon are not the Net's monarchs, nor yet are their minions or algorithms. Not the governments of the Earth nor their Trade Associations have the consent of the networked to bestride the Net as sovereigns.
4. We hold the Internet in common and as unowned.
5. From us and from what we have built on it does the Internet derive all its value.
6. The Net is of us, by us, and for us.
7. The Internet is ours.

b. The Internet is nothing and has no purpose.

8. The Internet is not a thing any more than gravity is a thing. Both pull us together.
9. The Internet is no-thing at all. At its base the Internet is a set of agreements, which the geeky among us (long may their names be hallowed) call "protocols," but which we might, in the temper of the day, call "commandments."

10. The first among these is: Thy network shall move all packets closer to their destinations without favor or delay based on origin, source, content, or intent.

11. Thus does this First Commandment lay open the Internet to every idea, application, business, quest, vice, and whatever.

12. There has not been a tool with such a general purpose since language.

13. This means the Internet is not for anything in particular. Not for social networking, not for documents, not for advertising, not for business, not for education, not for porn, not for anything. It is specifically designed for everything.

14. Optimizing the Internet for one purpose de-optimizes it for all others

15. The Internet like gravity is indiscriminate in its attraction. It pulls us all together, the virtuous and the wicked alike.

c. The Net is not content.

16. There is great content on the Internet. But holy mother of cheeses, the Internet is not made out of content.

17. A teenager's first poem, the blissful release of a long-kept secret, a fine sketch drawn by a palsied hand, a blog post in a regime that hates the sound of its people's voices — none of these people sat down to write content.

18. Did we use the word "content" without quotes? We feel so dirty.

d. The Net is not a medium.

19. The Net is not a medium any more than a
    conversation is a medium.
20. On the Net, we are the medium. We are the
    ones who move messages. We do so every
    time we post or retweet, send a link in an email,
    or post it on a social network.
21. Unlike a medium, you and I leave our
    fingerprints, and sometimes bite marks, on the
    messages we pass. We tell people why we're
    sending it. We argue with it. We add a joke.
    We chop off the part we don't like. We make
    these messages our own.
22. Every time we move a message through the
    Net, it carries a little bit of ourselves with it.
23. We only move a message through this
    "medium" if it matters to us in one of the infinite
    ways that humans care about something.
24. Caring — mattering — is the motive force of the
    Internet.

e. The Web is a Wide World.

25. In 1991, Tim Berners-Lee used the Net to
    create a gift he gave freely to us all: the World
    Wide Web. Thank you.
26. Tim created the Web by providing protocols
    (there's that word again!) that say how to write
    a page that can link to any other page without
    needing anyone's permission.
27. Boom. Within ten years we had billions of
    pages on the Web — a combined effort on the

order of a World War, and yet so benign that
the biggest complaint was the tag.

28. The Web is an impossibly large, semi-persistent
    realm of items discoverable in their dense
    inter-connections.

29. That sounds familiar. Oh, yeah, that's what the
    world is.

30. Unlike the real world, every thing and every
    connection on the Web was created by some
    one of us expressing an interest and an
    assumption about how those small pieces go
    together.

31. Every link by a person with something to say is
    an act of generosity and selflessness, bidding
    our readers leave our page to see how the
    world looks to someone else.

32. The Web remakes the world in our collective,
    emergent image.

But oh how we have strayed, sisters and brothers...

a. How did we let conversation get weaponized, anyway?

33. It's important to notice and cherish the talk, the
    friendship, the thousand acts of sympathy,
    kindness, and joy we encounter on the Internet.

34. And yet we hear the words "fag" and "nigger"
    far more on the Net than off.

35. Demonization of 'them' — people with looks,
    languages, opinions, memberships and other

  groupings we don't understand, like, or tolerate — is worse than ever on the Internet.

36. Women in Saudi Arabia can't drive? Meanwhile, half of us can't speak on the Net without looking over our shoulders.

37. Hatred is present on the Net because it's present in the world, but the Net makes it easier to express and to hear.

38. The solution: If we had a solution, we wouldn't be bothering you with all these damn clues.

39. We can say this much: Hatred didn't call the Net into being, but it's holding the Net — and us — back.

40. Let's at least acknowledge that the Net has values implicit in it. Human values.

41. Viewed coldly the Net is just technology. But it's populated by creatures who are warm with what they care about: their lives, their friends, the world we share.

42. The Net offers us a common place where we can be who we are, with others who delight in our differences.

43. No one owns that place. Everybody can use it. Anyone can improve it.

44. That's what an open Internet is. Wars have been fought for less.

b. "We agree about everything. I find you fascinating!"

45. The world is spread out before us like a buffet, and yet we stick with our steak and potatoes, lamb and hummus, fish and rice, or whatever.

46. We do this in part because conversation requires a common ground: shared language, interests, norms, understandings. Without those, it's hard or even impossible to have a conversation.

47. Shared grounds spawn tribes. The Earth's solid ground kept tribes at a distance, enabling them to develop rich differences. Rejoice! Tribes give rise to Us vs. Them and war. Rejoice? Not so much.

48. On the Internet, the distance between tribes starts at zero.

49. Apparently knowing how to find one another interesting is not as easy as it looks.

50. That's a challenge we can meet by being open, sympathetic, and patient. We can do it, team! We're #1! We're #1!

51. Being welcoming: There's a value the Net needs to learn from the best of our real world cultures.

c. Marketing still makes it harder to talk.

52. We were right the first time: Markets are conversations.

53. A conversation isn't your business tugging at our sleeve to shill a product we don't want to hear about.

54. If we want to know the truth about your products, we'll find out from one another.

55. We understand that these conversations are incredibly valuable to you. Too bad. They're ours.

56. You're welcome to join our conversation, but only if you tell us who you work for, and if you can speak for yourself and as yourself.

57. Every time you call us "consumers" we feel like cows looking up the word "meat."

58. Quit fracking our lives to extract data that's none of your business and that your machines misinterpret.

59. Don't worry: we'll tell you when we're in the market for something. In our own way. Not yours. Trust us: this will be good for you.

60. Ads that sound human but come from your marketing department's irritable bowels, stain the fabric of the Web.

61. When personalizing something is creepy, it's a pretty good indication that you don't understand what it means to be a person.

62. Personal is human. Personalized isn't.

63. The more machines sound human, the more they slide down into the uncanny valley where everything is a creep show.

64. Also: Please stop dressing up ads as news in the hope we'll miss the little disclaimer hanging off their underwear.

65. When you place a "native ad," you're eroding not just your own trustworthiness, but the trustworthiness of this entire new way of being with one another.

66. And, by the way, how about calling "native ads" by any of their real names: "product placement," "advertorial," or "fake fucking news"?

67. Advertisers got along without being creepy for

generations. They can get along without being creepy on the Net, too.

d. The Gitmo of the Net.

68. We all love our shiny apps, even when they're sealed as tight as a Moon base. But put all the closed apps in the world together and you have a pile of apps.
69. Put all the Web pages together and you have a new world.
70. Web pages are about connecting. Apps are about control.
71. As we move from the Web to an app-based world, we lose the commons we were building together.
72. In the Kingdom of Apps, we are users, not makers.
73. Every new page makes the Web bigger. Every new link makes the Web richer.
74. Every new app gives us something else to do on the bus.
75. Ouch, a cheap shot!
76. Hey, "CheapShot" would make a great new app! It's got "in-app purchase" written all over it.

e. Gravity's great until it sucks us all into a black hole.

77. Non-neutral applications built on top of the neutral Net are becoming as inescapable as the pull of a black hole.

78. If Facebook is your experience of the Net, then you've strapped on goggles from a company with a fiduciary responsibility to keep you from ever taking the goggles off.

79. Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple are all in the goggles business. The biggest truth their goggles obscure: These companies want to hold us the way black holes hold light.

80. These corporate singularities are dangerous not because they are evil. Many of them in fact engage in quite remarkably civic behavior. They should be applauded for that.

81. But they benefit from the gravity of sociality: The "network effect" is that thing where lots of people use something because lots of people use it.

82. Where there aren't competitive alternatives, we need to be hypervigilant to remind these Titans of the Valley of the webby values that first inspired them.

83. And then we need to honor the sound we make when any of us bravely pulls away from them. It's something between the noise of a rocket leaving the launchpad and the rip of Velcro as you undo a too-tight garment.

f. Privacy in an age of spies.

84. Ok, government, you win. You've got our data. Now, what can we do to make sure you use it against Them and not against Us? In fact, can you tell the difference?

85. If we want our government to back off, the deal

has to be that if — when — the next attack comes, we can't complain that they should have surveilled us harder.

86. A trade isn't fair trade if we don't know what we're giving up. Do you hear that, Security for Privacy trade-off?

87. With a probability approaching absolute certainty, we are going to be sorry we didn't do more to keep data out of the hands of our governments and corporate overlords.

g. Privacy in an age of weasels.

88. Personal privacy is fine for those who want it. And we all draw the line somewhere.

89. Q: How long do you think it took for pre-Web culture to figure out where to draw the lines? A: How old is culture?

90. The Web is barely out of its teens. We are at the beginning, not the end, of the privacy story.

91. We can only figure out what it means to be private once we figure out what it means to be social. And we've barely begun to re-invent that.

92. The economic and political incentives to de-pants and up-skirt us are so strong that we'd be wise to invest in tinfoil underwear.

93. Hackers got us into this and hackers will have to get us out.

To build and to plant

a. Kumbiyah sounds surprisingly good in an echo chamber.

94. The Internet is astounding. The Web is awesome. You are beautiful. Connect us all and we are more crazily amazing than Jennifer Lawrence. These are simple facts.

95. So let's not minimize what the Net has done in the past twenty years:

96. There's so much more music in the world.

97. We now make most of our culture for ourselves, with occasional forays to a movie theater for something blowy-uppy and a $9 nickel-bag of popcorn.

98. Politicians now have to explain their positions far beyond the one-page "position papers" they used to mimeograph.

99. Anything you don't understand you can find an explanation for. And a discussion about. And an argument over. Is it not clear how awesome that is?

100. You want to know what to buy? The business that makes an object of desire is now the worst source of information about it. The best source is all of us.

101. You want to listen in on a college-level course about something you're interested in? Google your topic. Take your pick. For free.

102. Yeah, the Internet hasn't solved all the world's problems. That's why the Almighty hath given us asses: that we might get off of them.

103. Internet naysayers keep us honest. We just like
      'em better when they aren't ingrates.

b. A pocket full of homilies.

104. We were going to tell you how to fix the
      Internet in four easy steps, but the only one we
      could remember is the last one: profit. So
      instead, here are some random thoughts…
105. We should be supporting the artists and
      creators who bring us delight or ease our
      burdens.
106. We should have the courage to ask for the help
      we need.
107. We have a culture that defaults to sharing and
      laws that default to copyright. Copyright has its
      place, but when in doubt, open it up
108. In the wrong context, everyone's an a-hole.
      (Us, too. But you already knew that.) So if
      you're inviting people over for a swim, post the
      rules. All trolls, out of the pool!
109. If the conversations at your site are going
      badly, it's your fault.
110. Wherever the conversation is happening, no
      one owes you a response, no matter how
      reasonable your argument or how winning your
      smile.
111. Support the businesses that truly "get" the Web.
      You'll recognize them not just because they
      sound like us, but because they're on our side.
112. Sure, apps offer a nice experience. But the Web
      is about links that constantly reach out,
      connecting us without end. For lives and ideas,

completion is death. Choose life.

113. Anger is a license to be stupid. The Internet's
     streets are already crowded with licensed
     drivers.
114. Live the values you want the Internet to
     promote.
115. If you've been talking for a while, shut up. (We
     will very soon.)

c. Being together: the cause of and solution to every problem.

116. If we have focused on the role of the People of
     the Net — you and us — in the Internet's fall
     from grace, that's because we still have the
     faith we came in with.
117. We, the People of the Net, cannot fathom how
     much we can do together because we are far
     from finished inventing how to be together.
118. The Internet has liberated an ancient force —
     the gravity drawing us together.
119. The gravity of connection is love.
120. Long live the open Internet.
121. Long may we have our Internet to love.

This is an Open Source document.

Make them your own. We only request
that you please point back at this original
page (http://cluetrain.com/newclues/)
because that's just polite.

If you are a developer, the text of this
page is openly available at GitHub for
programmatic re-use:
https://github.com/dweinberger/newclues

To make it as easy as possible to share,
use, and re-use the clues, we have put
all the text on this page into the public
domain via a Creative Commons 0
license. It is essentially copyright free.