

This article has been originally published in: *América Latina en Movimiento*, No. 494, ALAI, Quito, April 2014, English edition: <http://www.alainet.org/publica/494-en.phtml> ; Spanish edition: <http://www.alainet.org/publica/494.phtml> ; used with permission.

Norbert Bollow <nb@bollow.ch>

## **Root Causes of Internet Social Justice or Injustice**

The Internet is not only useful; it is also dramatically transforming our societies. In this respect, I expect that some decisions that will be taken in the very near future will have a profound long-term impact on the future of human society. I feel that we are at the threshold of some kind of defining constitutional moment for the future of humanity. By this, I mean that just as the overall political structures of a country are to a large extent determined by its constitution, some important aspects of the future of humanity are going to be determined by how certain technical matters regarding the Internet are decided.

Mass surveillance, as documented by the Snowden disclosures, is a good example of this. As long as at least some of the world's intelligence services have significant funding and no respect for the internationally recognized human right to privacy, it is inevitable that international mass surveillance will continue for as long as it is technically feasible. But why is it feasible? The reason is that those who have been making the relevant technical decisions have not considered it a requirement to prevent mass surveillance. From a technical perspective, adequately protecting the privacy of communications (including some reasonable degree of protection of the so-called metadata, which includes in particular information about who communicates with whom) is not an easy task. But it is not impossibly hard either. It is surely an easier task than to design an airplane which allows us to travel from one continent to another in less than a day.

From a political economy perspective, international mass surveillance is primarily about power. It represents a huge concentration of power. Since among the political leaders of just about any country, there will be some who have an embarrassing secret in their life, the power of mass surveillance implies the power to topple just about any democratic government. Or maybe the intelligence agency which holds this power would prefer to use it for blackmail. It is absolutely scary to consider what a Hitler 2.0 would do with the kind of surveillance capability that the NSA is now known to possess. Hence ICT systems which are not adequately designed to protect communications privacy are a form of social injustice. In fact, undermining democracy in foreign countries is one of the worst kinds of large-scale social injustice that I can imagine.

In the realm of political institutions, concentrations of power are of course also a potentially serious problem. However, the constitution of every democratic country has been carefully designed to prevent dangerous concentrations of power. There is a careful division of powers between the different institutions, and there are checks and balances. Similarly, we need to insist that the power that any government or company can have on the global Internet must be limited. For example, Microsoft, Facebook and Google are each unreasonably and unacceptably powerful.

Unfortunately, the current system of what is often grandly called “Internet governance” lacks any mechanism to effectively diffuse such concentrations of power. This is, however, not generally recognized as a problem. Quite on the contrary, the upcoming “Netmundial”<sup>1</sup> meeting is intended to enshrine “multistakeholder governance” as a fundamental principle of Internet governance. For all intents and purposes, this would be a constitutional principle for the Internet, and by implication also for the worldwide information society. Multistakeholder governance is an ideology which implies the belief that democratically elected governments and parliaments should not exercise any power to make decisions in relation to the Internet, but rather all governance decisions should be

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://netmundial.br>

made by a multistakeholder consensus process, in which all stakeholders, including representatives of governments, civil society and private companies, can participate fully and equally.

I am not at all opposed to multistakeholder consensus processes being used for decision-making whenever it is possible to reach a consensus. My objection is against effectively adopting it as a kind of constitutional principle that consensus processes are the only kind of decision making processes that can legitimately be used in regard to the Internet. This principle would imply that no decision could ever be taken that would solve the problem that some companies are overly powerful, because the powerful companies could simply oppose and thereby prevent such a decision from being taken. Of course, when no explicit decision can be made in regard to conflicts of interest between particular commercial interests and some aspect of the public interest, such a lack of a decision-making process is a decision in itself. In that kind of situation, powerful profit-oriented companies are automatically able to do whatever they want, to the full extent of what the market will allow them to get away with, with no chance for public interest oriented regulation.

The alternative which I would propose<sup>2</sup> in situations where there are genuinely conflicting interests (i.e. conflicts which persist after a reasonable attempt has been made to resolve the issue by means of a consensus process), is that the best approach will be to develop competing proposals, corresponding to different perspectives on the issue, and to then have national parliaments make the perhaps difficult decision of choosing between these options. Clearly the set of proposals should be designed for making it as unproblematic as possible for different countries to adopt different options.

On the other hand, there are existing multistakeholder processes which can be used to solve real problems (problems where there is no reason why, for example, existing standardization processes would not work to develop a solution), while at the same time preventing new dangerous power concentrations from emerging.

One very interesting example of this is the work on “web payments” at W3C, the World Wide Web Consortium<sup>3</sup>. Technically this initiative is based on advances in cryptography, which allow for secure implementation of payments without relying on a middleman such as PayPal or Western Union. The technology can be implemented to be usable everywhere where a web browser can be used, from TV sets over PCs to mobile telephones, and this has in fact already been done in the Firefox OS smartphone operating system.<sup>4</sup>

Importantly, the goal here is to create a technical standard that can be freely implemented by anyone. In this regard, the planned “web payments” are going to be like email rather than like WhatsApp or Facebook or PayPal. That however is not sufficient to ensure that the technology will positively contribute to social justice, and avoid contributing to social injustice. If implemented without consideration of fairness, non-discrimination and consumer protection concerns, a “web payments” technology could easily result in new social injustices. Removing the payment processing service as a middleman is good, but there is a need for flanking measures to prevent it from creating problems.

There are several reasons why it is good and important to create a payment processing service that does not rely on a middleman. Two of these reasons are related to the fees which a payment processing service levies: these do not only cost the users of the service money, they also tend to prevent some applications involving very small amounts of money, so called micropayments. Then there is also the risk of monopolization: if no standardized web payments solution is available, chances are that the kind of network-effects-driven winner-take-all economics which are so often

---

<sup>2</sup> For the specifics of a concrete proposal along these lines, see <http://WisdomTaskForce.org>

<sup>3</sup> <http://w3c.org>

<sup>4</sup> <https://web-payments.org/>

seen in the online realm would concentrate most of the market for online payment processing in the hands of a single company. Such a dominant market position would represent a huge concentration of power that could be abused easily.

On the other hand, when web payments are processed without a middleman, that creates a difficulty, because the payment processing service is removed as a point of possible regulation for the benefit of consumers. For example, the payment processing service cannot then be given a role of acting as a gatekeeper to protect consumers from fraudulent merchants.

Due to the international nature of the Internet, there is also no straightforward way to rely on the traditional legal system to ensure that the consumer can get a refund if an online merchant acts fraudulently. One solution to this problem might be to build a refund mechanism into the web payments system, which would allow consumer courts in the consumer's country of residence to initiate a refund, and a requirement for online merchants to have a bank guarantee that ensures that such authorized refunds will actually get paid out.

Hence, seemingly technical topics on web payments are actually very much of a kind where the design decisions need to be made primarily on the basis of consumer protection and other social justice concerns. This cannot simply be left to technical experts! It is important for a variety of civil society organizations, with a range of perspectives from different cultural and economic contexts, to engage in this area. Not engaging at the current stage when this technology can still be shaped could quite possibly end up being a root cause of social injustice within a couple of years.

**Norbert Bollow** works as an independent consultant on technical matters and on solving business problems. He has also been active for many years in the Free and Open Source Software (FOSS) movement and in broader social justice oriented advocacy related to the Internet.