Bryant University

HONORS THESIS

ICANN, Cultural Imperialism, and Democratization of Internet Governance

BY Brian Gailey

ADVISOR • Kevin Pearce
_____

Table of Contents

ICANN, Cultural Imperialism, and Democratization of Internet Governance
Senior Capstone Project for Brian Gailey

ABSTRACT

Internet Governance has largely been managed by the United States government since its burgeoning in the 1990's. The government has since entrusted and charged internet technical tasks and functions to ICANN. The organization along with the United States government has been the subject of heavy criticism for its inadequate international representation. Many interpret US hegemony over the internet as culturally imperialistic. The following paper explores the some of the advantages and disadvantages to multilateral Internet governance. Firstly, it will evaluate ICANN's ability to both democratize their internal decision-making and internationalize the web by better serving foreign Internet end-users. Next, the paper examines the attitudes of Americans towards the US relinquishing control to international organizations such as the United Nations. The conclusions address both effectiveness of ICANN as well as what may be hindering the US from surrendering control to foreign governments based on nonpolitical reasons.

INTRODUCTION

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is a non-profit corporation based in Marina Del Rey, California. ICANN assumed various internet-related technical responsibilities as of September 18, 1998. The organization supplanted the United States government's Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) and oversees the IANA's function. Since its inception, ICANN has come under heavy criticism and scrutiny for harboring a US bias. Many claim ICANN organizationally favors the US government's agenda and does not fairly represent the welfare of the largely non-American internet community. Much of the scrutiny, while critical, is accurate.

The Internet began as a domestic creation and until the 1990's was largely contained within the United States. Today, the internet is a powerful, global medium with a reach that passes over transnational boundaries. However, ICANN continues to operate out of little-known Marina Del Rey, California as a United States private corporation. Since the United States government established ICANN, the Internet landscape has changed drastically to what it is today. However, the US government has extended their contract with ICANN through 2011 (McCarthy, 2006). The question becomes whether or not ICANN satisfies the current demands of the world's Internet population.

The following paper examines how ICANN and Americans are reacting to potential internet and internet governance change. More specifically, the paper examines the attitudes of Americans towards relinquishing control of internet governance, specifically concerning the dilemma between censorship and duty. Next, the paper explores what ICANN is currently doing to internationalize and democratize the internet and internet governance. Recent initiatives include the expansion of top level domains and internationalized domain names. Both initiatives will be explored to identify their impact on the international community and democratization. Lastly, the paper looks at the procedures in which ICANN concludes whether or not a new top level domain meets the international standards of morality.

A distinction can be made between democratization and internationalization of the web. For the purpose of the paper, internationalization refers to the improvement of the internet as a

global communicative medium for as many users as possible. We may think of the utilitarian's greatest good for the greatest number, or otherwise we may think of it as a matter of inclusion and equality between peoples and cultures. Increased democratization, in contrast, may lead to the better internationalization of the World Wide Web. To democratize internet governance will mean to better incorporate an international presence and influence into the current state of internet governance.

ICANN

ICANN's website includes a customary about page, which describes in laymen's terms without the "wish-wash" of technical jargon. The first paragraph plainly describes the need for technical coordination of unique identifiers:

> To reach another person on the Internet you have to type an
> address into your computer – a name or a number. That address
> has to be unique so computers know where to find each other.
> ICANN coordinates these unique identifiers across the world.
> Without that coordination we wouldn't have a global Internet.

The second paragraph states its dedication to various goals and ideals, and the third paragraph pronounces ICANN's inherent nonexistent control over content on the internet. "ICANN doesn't control content on the Internet."

Overall, the three paragraphs encapsulate one purpose: to communicate that they are bounded to technical duties and play no role in policy-making functions. Conversely, elements of ICANN's heavy international scrutiny include contrary implications implicit and inherent in these three detailed responsibilities (King, 2004). These criticisms are founded on the fact that ICANN is naturally assuming greater governmental roles than simple technical functions. While their self-described purposes and missions are not false, they are commonly believed to be incomplete in regards to their broader significances. Therein lays the problem. A US-run organization, while asserting independence of the government, is going to reflect American ideals. The effects are both of favoritism and of cultural imperialism. For example, ICANN allows registrars to pay and compete for the rights to top level domains. The American essence of capitalism unduly transmits itself through their procedures. While ICANN is tasked by the United States Department of Commerce to preserve the domain name system, they have inherited global issues. Furthermore, as will be discussed later, much of the content on the internet is in English and supported for English speakers while more and more users are non-English speakers. The disparity between English and American content to non-

English and non-American users creates cultural and linguistic imperialism.

CULTURAL IMPERIALISM

Scholars define cultural imperialism in a variety of ways. A simple denotation of the term is "the imposition of a foreign viewpoint or civilization on a people" (The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition, 2005). Alternately it has been described as,

> The sum of the processes by which a society is brought into the
> modern world system, and how its dominating stratum is
> attracted, pressured, forced, and sometimes bribed into shaping
> social institutions to correspond to, or even to promote, the
> values and structures of the dominant center of the system
> (Galeota, 2004, p. 1)

Many believe that American conglomerates have penetrated and permeated many walks of life across the globe. Their presence is ubiquitous and is sometimes described as destructive to foreign cultures. McDonald's and American movies can be found across the world, in both rich and poor countries. The Internet harbors a more interesting medium for culturally imperialistic dynamics. The issues of language and unilateral internet governance impede upon the sovereignties of others as well as their ability to preserve and transmit their cultures as America does. To combat American cultural imperialism countries have had to resort to measures that Americans would find objectionable.

> Fear of the cultural upheaval that could result from this
> exposure to new information has driven governments in
> communist China and Cuba to strictly monitor and regulate their
> citizens' access to websites (these protectionist policies aren't
> totally effective, however, because they are difficult to
> implement and maintain). Paradoxically, limiting access to the
> Internet nearly ensures that countries will remain largely the

recipients, rather than the contributors, of information on the
Internet (Galeota, 2004, p. 3).

The reactionary policy creates a disconnect between the users of the world and disrupts the
flow of cultural information in both directions. The frustration of the current state of affairs
was expressed by Isis Executive Director Raijeli Nicole,

We're not happy with the US which already has supremacy in
current geopolitics having sole ownership of one resource,
particularly the internet…The North's greatest power lies not in
economics and politics but in its ability to define meanings,
cultures and identities (ISIS International-Manila, 2006, p. 1).

The statement was made in reaction to the 2005 WSIS meeting regarding internet governance.
Similar sentiments have been shared by others.

The Internet is the most recent and the most sinister facet of
American cultural imperialism to emerge: the internet is
anchored in the United States; the vast majority of World Wide
Web sites are based in the US and are in English; most software
used to navigate the Internet is in English; and search engines
are in English (Kim, 1998, p. 4).

While the previous statement is dated, the essence pervades today in a milder form.

The French, one of the fiercest protectionists of culture and heritage, have taken the hardest
stance on many culturally imperialistic activities. In 2005, Google announced a project that
sent 15 million documents and books from the finest American universities to the web. The
French government reacted to the Google-led project by declaring their own ambitious plan to
put European documents online. In response, the French President Jacques Chirac referred to
their project as a "counter-offensive." The French issued a number of statements,

> A vast movement of digitalization of knowledge is underway
> across the world. With the wealth of their exceptional cultural
> heritage, France and Europe must play a decisive part. It is a
> fundamental challenge for the spread of knowledge and the
> development of cultural diversity (The China Daily, 2005).

Despite the fact that such a wealth of knowledge was announced to become accessible to the world, the analysis of the Google-led initiative by the French President and European officials has led to the interpretation of American cultural imperialism. They expressed fears "a crushing American domination in the definition of how future generations conceive the world" (The China Daily, 2005). The notion of American literature defining the world repulses European officials. "Fear of American cultural hegemony has been a constant of French policy" (The China Daily, 2005). Many of the domestic industries of France are subsidized and shielded by their legal system in order to protect its cultural.

With this example, ICANN does not appear to have much direct involvement in the ongoing cultural battle. While this is ostensibly true, there are still concerns regarding their relation to how internet content is indirectly affected. As was included above, ICANN asserts that it "doesn't control content on the Internet…and it doesn't deal with access to the Internet." Yet, matters of language, for example, are directly related to access to the Internet. ICANN may mean to say that they do not deal with direct efforts to assist emerging economies with Internet access. However, a matter such as what language the domain name system accepts would appear to relate to how accessible the internet is. ASCII is king, and one would believe that users in Korea, for instance, would prefer an internet with their own characters.

The intuitive solution to the current issue of internet governance is to forfeit power to the United Nations. It is already democratized and favors some of the major internet players via the permanent Security Council. Despite the benefits, a thematic issue arises when we consider "authoritarian regimes such as China, Saudi Arabia, and Iran" taking greater roles with an international internet (USA TODAY, 2005). While international opinion claims American hegemony, the US government claims that ICANN is not state-run and that relinquishing control would signal devolution toward the long since passed governmentally

overseen telecommunications (Cukier, 2005). What's more, it may be a "recipe for stifling bureaucracy and indecision" (USA TODAY, 2005). However, there are two problems that will persist. First, different governments with a wide array of agendas may defect (as is believed to be a legitimate possibility), thus compromising the internet's integrity as a global medium. Second, it can be argued that the United States has a duty to the rest of the world. The argument is deontological, whereas other security-related, economic, and socio-political concerns are consequential reasons and are discussed at length by Cukier in "*Multilateral Control of Internet Infrastructure and its Impact on US Sovereignty*."

International internet users now outnumber American ones (King, 2006). China has even overtaken the US in the number of broadband lines (according to analysts with Point Topic) (Gonsalves, 2008). Furthermore, the attitude held by non-American United Nation representatives is that ""The internet is transnational. It can't be under the authority of one country or even some countries," said Brazil's Culture Minister Gilberto Gil…setting the conference's tone" (Astor, 2007). While these issues that work for greater democratization endure, the point that resounds heavily with Americans is the potential for other nations to "politicize the internet and more easily impose censorship" (Astor, 2007). These forces are at odds and do not look like they will be resolved with a sound multilateral system in neither the immediate future nor the intermediate future. One certainty will be the foray of attacks from international governments and scholars for its close ties to the US government and lack of democracy. The current unilateral course leaves ICANN with the need to more effectively assume Net neutrality as defined and propounded by Professor Milton Mueller (Meuller, 2007).

CENSORSHIP

Mentioned above is the concern of censorship in regards to surrendering control to more censorship prone countries. The idea resonates with Americans because it is easily and simplistically understood as "un-American." Various nations have different takes on their freedoms of speech with just one example being the freedom to offend. Many nations including Canada, England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, South Africa, Australia, and India ban hate speech domestically or have signed international conventions (Liptak, 2008). Americans, however, are repulsed by the notion, especially at the mention of nations like China and Iran gaining greater say. Yet, the conflicting beliefs of democracy and duty pose a dilemma when considering the rest of the internet world. Most would intuit that all are entitled to equal access to the World Wide Web as discussed in Net Neutrality, which places an obligation on others (like ICANN and the American government) to abide by their (international internet users') rights. The argument places the onus on ICANN and the United States government to do as they feel best supports the rights of international internet users. The question whittles down to whether or not it is believed that the right thing is being done for others. Currently, what is considered to be right for others is being judged with American standards. European Union representatives and other nations are strongly demanding United Nations management, although "a consensus of national governments is not a good proxy for the global public interest" (Mueller, Political Oversight of ICANN: A Briefing for the WSIS Summit, 2005). Americans are left with an ambivalence pitting the risk of sacrificing freedoms of expression against what is arguably for the greater good.

The American interpretation of the utilitarian's greatest good for the greatest number poses an interesting conflict. Intuitively, one would think that maximizing utility would be effected by a multilateral approach to internet governance. However, if Americans believe that restraining censorship is what is best for other nations, then maintaining US control may seem attractive from a utilitarian perspective. A singular internet governance authority becomes a more legitimate possibility from this rationale. Moreover, the fear of empowering censorship practices conflicts with JS Mills' marketplace of ideas. The consequentialist argument relates

to how ideas flow freely and, thus, how it then maximizes the communicative flows of the Internet. Of course, the interpretation of JS Mills' marketplace of ideas would be based on an American construal, but it is still prevalent. Any apprehension of relinquishing control is legitimate.

The American marketplace of ideas and utilitarian perspectives conflict with the need to relinquish control as a result of duty to others. If the US surrenders control, then changes will be made beyond the singular authority of the US government. Different legal interpretations may be applied causing a transnational exposure of legal philosophies. This sort of legal pluralism is not well received nor tolerated, no matter how well-meaning a multilateral solution is. Countries enjoy and hold precious their sovereignty and dislike the idea of being unable to maintain control within their borders. The United States is no different. Nevertheless, these tradeoffs are inevitable with compromise, which explains the US government's resistance.

China and Myanmar
Early in 2008 China blocked both Google News and YouTube due to the protests in Tibet. The move was ostensibly made to repress the diffusion of video coverage showing demonstrations in Tibet. Roughly 13 civilians died during the riots which included law enforcement casualties. Myanmar, like China, also has blocked internet access in order to quell government protests (Gohring, 2007). Not only individuals within the country are affected. The blockage disrupts the flow of photos and videos throughout the world. The country's government closed all internet cafes and shutdown the government's telecommunications provider. The practice is in harmony with Myanmar's general stranglehold on all forms of media.

Transparency of government is a highly valued trait among democracies. When a national government like Myanmar and China can conceal and manipulate the flow of information, concerns arise over governmental accountability. The incident in Myanmar, without the internet, "may otherwise have gone under reported" (Williams, 2007). Since 2008, China has continued to ban access to YouTube with the latest incident occurring in March of 2009. The Centre for Democracy and Technology, an advocacy group for cyber-liberties, referred to "the

rule of law and the right to freedom of expression" (Shiels, 2009). The idea asserts the notion of universal and natural law and its imposition upon all nations regardless of the enumerated, positive law. The Chinese government has yet to address why they blocked access or when it shall be restored.

Governmental accountability poses a unique question in regards to these examples. Americans often object to any sort of large government for which resembles 1984's "Big Brother." The acts of China and Myanmar could easily be equated to that of a "Ministry of Truth," which resonates in a deeply eerie and chilling manner with Americans.

Myanmar protests occurred in 2007, but unlike in the past the Internet captured the events.

> Video of the protests has flashed around the world and first-
> hand accounts from citizens have appeared on blogs and
> independent media sites. News agencies have sometimes
> struggled to verify the accuracy of the information coming from
> the country, but in general the Internet has served to shed light
> on a crisis that may otherwise have gone under reported
> (Williams, 2007).

Despite the Myanmar government's tight grasp around the internet and the media, the leakage serves as an outlet to disallow the manipulation of information and truth.

> The loss of internet access in Myanmar has slowed the tide of
> photos and videos shared with the rest of the world but people
> outside of the troubled country continue to use new media sites
> and other technologies to protest military activity in the
> Southeast Asia country (Gohring, 2007).

The profusion of the activism and violence has allowed the world to discuss Myanmar and the protests despite the Internet blackout. A website in Norway called the Democratic Voice of Burma was able to continue to post pictures and notes, that is "until the Internet connection went down" (Gohring, 2007). It is unknown how opening internet governance to the world

will directly affect any and all forms of activism, but the examples of Myanmar and China

demonstrate and showcase the fears of American attitudes.

MY NAME, MY LANGUAGE, MY INTERNET

The resultant impasse between the US and world leaves ICANN as one of the primary targets of criticism and as the primary agent for internationalizing the web. A major goal they have undertaken is to more completely incorporate non-Latin-based languages. The My Name, My Language, My Internet initiative was released on their website in October of 2007. Internet users may test eleven new language scripts including Arabic, Cyrillic, Greek, Hebrew, and Tamil. The domain name system, which coordinates the matching of hostnames to internet protocol addresses, was not designed to understand many scripts used by international users. The ongoing challenge is to adopt an elaborate system to allow the domain name system to accept the eleven new scripts. The development may or may not actually help international users. Systems have been created to allow non-English speakers to better manage a global medium that is, arguably, linguistically imperialistic. At least private companies like VeriSign have been experimenting with non-ASCII characters (Perera).

President Dmitry Medvedev of Russia demonstrates the latest of pressures to create a truly multilingual system. The Russian President himself appealed to ICANN to include Cyrillic. It was claimed out of pride, representation (300 million Russian speakers), and its significance in encouraging "the importance of Russian as a language" (IDNNews, 2008). On one hand Russian is still a relatively prominent language in the world, but the recurring issue of control resurfaces as some fear the government's grip on the media may tighten upon gaining influence over the currently unfettered World Wide Web. However, unlike with democratization of internet governance, this example of internationalization does not impact the sovereignty of other nations—it remains a domestic concern to the country of Russia. ICANN does not have a right to consider the potential repercussions and ramifications of a better enabled Russian government. What's more, Russia has a right to an internet medium that is completely in its native language, and so it is the duty and obligation of ICANN to adhere to their right to equal access.

President and CEO of ICANN Paul Twomey remarked that in India there are "more than 100 million people who read English but a billion who don't" (RedOrbit, 2008). ICANN states that they recognize the need to develop website names in other scripts. Like in the case of Russia, the project enhances the communicative value of the internet by tearing down the digital divide. Furthermore, the cultural identity associated is a "major symbolic issue" said Eric Besson, French Minister in charge of development of a digital economy. The international reception to ICANN's undertaking has been expectedly positive and widely hailed. The political significance cannot be underappreciated. ICANN's and the United States government's unilateral prevalence, while still challenged, can better persist by appeasing and accommodating foreign stakeholders and politicians. ICANN finds itself having more and more trouble avoiding issues of politics and cultural clashes, which is much to the contradiction of their "purely technical stewardship" status.

Under the principle of Net neutrality (as propounded by Professor Milton Mueller of Syracuse University), ICANN's work towards bridging the digital divide can be helped by tackling the issue of language. According to a report from the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), the number of international users will continue to close the gap between English and non-English speakers (John Paolillo, 2005, 60) but will be inhibited by internet support for these languages (John Paolillo, 2005, 96). Furthermore, the current user population's language support is comprised of only 43.28% Latin-script (John Paolillo, 2005, 94). Language diversity is growing at such a rate that it is quickly becoming one of ICANN's greater concerns.

The Internet World Stats organization lists the top languages used on the internet. English ranks number one. Next includes (in descending order) Chinese, Spanish, Japanese, French, Portuguese, German, Arabic, Russian, and Korean. The number of English speakers compared to the world population is 18.6%. 81.4% of the internet's world population does not speak English. Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Russian, and Korean speakers comprise about 33.5% of the top languages used in the web. While China accounts for 20.3 percentage points of the 33.5%, over a third of the world's internet population uses a non-Latin-based script. What is more revealing and concerning is the growth from 2000 to 2008. Of the top ten

languages used on the web, English ranked well below the average of 324.6% at 218.4%. The entire world's languages grew by 338.1% in comparison. Of the top ten languages, growth ranked sixth in the United States. It was also below that of the rest of the world's languages combined, which weighed in at 423.6% in growth. The languages with the most impressive growth rates included Arabic (1,545.2%), Russian (1,125.8%), and Chinese (894.8%). The top three languages on the web all happen to not use Latin-based alphabets. While English is spoken by 18.6% of the population, the number of English-speaking users account for a disproportionate 28.6% of the total internet community. One would expect that overtime the percentage of English-speaking internet users divided by the total internet population should shift closer to the actual English-speaking percentage. Overall, the data suggests the need to accommodate those who do not speak English and use non-Latin-based scripts (Internet World Stats, 2009).

Concerning matters of the digital divide, with particular attention paid to Africa, the Internet World Stats organization identifies the near-billion person population of Africa as consisting of a meager 3.4% of the internet population. Only 5.6% of all Africans use the internet as compared to 74.4 % of all North Americans. Asia and the Middle East yield only 17.4% and 23.3% of their populations on the web. The figures are modest compared to other continents like Europe and Australia. While economics is an inescapable factor when considering these statistics, the growth rates and potential internet use by these other peoples poses a definite concern for ICANN and its ability to provide an internet that is equally valuable and meaningful to all users independent of language (Internet World Stats, 2009).

IANA
The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) is the organization that preceded the now established ICANN. IANA describes the delegation of the eleven evaluative internationalized level domains. The organization, like ICANN, attempts to provide transparency and allows users to view their ongoing functions. Information regarding the new internationalized domain names may be accessed through their website. The "IANA Report on Delegation of Eleven Evaluative Internationalized Top Level Domains" page details information regarding

the new scripts and the evaluation process. The scripts include two forms of Arabic, two

forms of Chinese, Cyrillic, Hindi, Greek, Korean, Yiddish, Japanese, and Tamil.

It was not until September of 2000 that ICANN officially recognized the need to include

internationalized domain names. After years of developing methods of IDN implementation

and coordinating with participating registries, the focus shifted in 2005 to the application on

the DNS Root Zone. Since June of 2007, ICANN released the draft IDN Evaluation Plan to

the public to allow open review. Currently, these web pages may be accessed in the eleven

various languages. The addresses do not appear in the desired scripts at first but are easily

enabled on any internet browser. By all accounts the test pages function well, with the

desired non-Latin-based script appearing in the address bar. There are issues related to the

design and implementation as discussed by Klensin (Klensin, 2004).

A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

Currently, there are generic, sponsored, reserved, pseudo, and country code top level domains. ICANN plans to expand the number of generic top level domains. At the time of the proposal, the President and CEO of ICANN described the move as

> …paving the way for an expansion of domain name choice and
> opportunity... it represents a whole new way for people to
> express themselves on the Net. It's a massive increase in the
> 'real estate' of the Internet (Dr Paul Twomey).

The introduction to new top level domains issued by ICANN is of particular interest, because of its seemingly increased sensitivity to international concerns.

In 2005, ICANN delayed and ultimately disapproved the introduction of the ".xxx" top level domain. Many found the acceptance of a pre-designated TLD as offensive and the controversy stirred by the debacle ultimately pressured ICANN into disapproving the ".xxx" TLD's candidacy. The result disallowed the existence of the top level domain from the internet, independent of where (or what country) the internet is accessed. ICANN's action poses a concern regarding their purely technical stewardship. Critics fear that this is another example of the US government injecting themselves unduly into matters they should remain less involved. It was the Governmental Advisory Committee who insisted (or more benignly "recommended") that there be "more time for additional government and public policy concerns to be expressed before reaching a final decision on ".xxx"" (CITE Cox, 2005). The Department of Commerce essentially passed down this concern after receiving "6,000 letters and email messages expressing concerns about the impact of the new domain on children and families" (Cox, 2005). Essentially, the opinions of American citizens superseded the normal democratic organizational channels erected within ICANN which were designed to empower internationally cooperative decision-making.

ICANN has bowed down to US authority in the past. A United Nations meeting held at Geneva in 2003 excluded the President of ICANN from internet governance discussions. It was described as a "fitting lesson in powerlessness for an organization that had enjoyed sweeping control since its founding in 1998" (RedOrbit, 2008). The lack of authority and influence is easily likened to that of other nations, "especially in the developing world, over the governance of the internet" (RedOrbit, 2008).

Dispute Settlement Considerations
The Dispute Settlement Considerations document details potential disputes and the types of settlements that may arise in the introduction of these new top level domains. Of particular interest in the document are the types of disputes that result from ""substantial opposition" from…[the] cultural or [the] language community…[or] are contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order." While the thought and intent is important, the process for which they place moral grades will be of particular interest. Their website reads:

> *Offensive names will be subject to an objection-based process*
> *based on public morality and order. This process will be*
> *conducted by an international arbitration body utilizing*
> *criteria drawing on provisions in a number of international*
> *treaties. ICANN will not be the decision maker on these*
> *objections.*

Again we see the mention and assertion by ICANN that they are not effectively a part of the decision-making process. Whether or not this is true, they state that dispute settlements may be resolved through an international arbitration committee. While they may in fact effectively follow through on their proposed plan, many will be critical of their ability to do so with criticisms abound.

The need for a policy-deciding body originates from the fact that nations vary in sensitivity and tolerance to various behaviors. A widely studied case in American law classes includes the National Socialist Party of America v. Village of Skokie where a neo-Nazi group was allowed to march through a largely Jewish suburban town with Swastika apparel and all. Compare this to the widely discussed case where EBay was forced by French courts to

remove Nazi paraphernalia from its auctions. The transnational movement of law and culture is a sensitive subject and the US is no different concerning its desire to retain its own set of values and laws.

The nature and extent of ICANN's proposal for an international arbitration committee (The International Chamber of Commerce based in Paris, France) is important. They may wish to simply placate the majority, or otherwise they may truly desire a fully operational, independent, and effective cultural morality board. The history of ICANN incorporating international influence contains many previous attempts, and the history is not auspicious; however, there are also signs that they may be able to correct this trend of failing to meet the democratization goals once made.

The Organizational Structure
For much of its existence, ICANN has maintained that the organization guarantees international influence. Naturally, the claim is contested and has been met with harsh criticism for failure. The very structure of ICANN and its Governmental Advisory Committee has been under fire for having the ability to exert undue influence on the final decision-makers (King, 2004). The At-Large membership has widely been viewed as a failure. The attempt at opening their doors to outside authority was largely pushed aside (Hofmann). Between the Governmental Advisory Committee and At-Large membership, ICANN's attempts to democratize the internet have been stopped well-short of increasing fair representation. However, it should be noted that representation on the Board of Directors shows a fairly wide inclusion. Many are foreigners (although primarily Caucasian). At face value the concerns and agendas may better fix them on a more international track. Even the Board of Director's Nominating Committee, NomCom, is composed of many non-Americans. Candidates for new positions are detailed on their website, which shows a fair geographic distribution of applicants from across the globe. If geographical representation on the boards of ICANN is any indication of international influence, then one may look more favorably upon them. However, despite the diversity of the Board of Directors, there still remains the concern of the disproportionate power of the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Democracy in general does not allow for one group to hold too much power and to go for the most part unchecked.

Based on some previous shortcomings to the built-in democratic channels, ICANN's effort should be treated with fair skepticism. Either the committee functions as purported, is little used/unused, is given insignificant power, is easily overturned, or is simply scrapped. What's more, with the number of new top level domain candidates, there is always the chance that this "international arbitration body" may not be needed. Still, ICANN's ability to delegate this policy-making duty to another entity is admirable. The body may function as a precedent for which ICANN can adopt for future subjects. The policy, while questionable in its application, should serve as a standard and guide.

RATIONALE & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Whether or not to transition from a unilateral control of internet governance to one of multilateralism is an ethical question. Opening control to other nations is likely the best means to quell issues of cultural imperialism. An international internet governance organization would set an agenda that better reflects the concerns of all nations by reducing biases. What's more, the right to sole authority over internet governance is highly suspect at this point. The people affected by any changes include everyone potentially. Any right the US has to decide what affects everyone is very questionable. Hence, questions arise over what is best for the international internet community and who has the ability and right to oversee governmental management for such a powerful medium. The end-users of the web are the ultimate stakeholders, and intergovernmental cooperation is often the best means to represent the interests of all peoples. Censorship, however, poses a problem when one considers relinquishing authority to all nations. There is uncertainty about the effects, which creates a fear of potential change. Therefore,

RQ1: What will be the attitudes of American persons regarding a multilateral approach to internet governance?

ICANN's mission should be in part to expand the Internet to as many audiences as can enjoy its capacities. ICANN should remedy any sort of language barrier that inhibits the growth of the Internet, because it is within the realm of their capabilities. Internationalized domain names provide an avenue to solve this "lingual-divide." Intuitively, including non-Latin-based scripts would enhance the viewing experiences for a portion of the internet population as well as possibly increase that segment's size. Therefore,

RQ2: How much will foreign internet users feel internationalized domain names improve the communicative value of the internet for.

METHODS

Procedure and Sample

For the first research question, participants were undergraduate students at a small, private New England school. A total of 139 subjects participated, with 58 male and 81 female. The average age was 20.61. We created a survey on SurveyMonkey.com and allowed participants to complete it. Refer to appendix A to view the actual survey. Students read a brief description of the current situation faced by ICANN, the United States Government, and the rest of the world and its many governments. Afterwards, students proceeded to answer twenty-four multiple choice questions measuring how important representation of end-users is versus the status quo (unilateralism), and how significant freedom of speech and censorship are in establishing those attitudes. The question regards whether or not the US should relinquish control of ICANN to all international governments. There are various factors for which respondents may find themselves concerned. First, there is the matter of how end-users are affected. Second, there is the question of what is thought of international cooperation and democracy. Lastly, the ideas of freedom of speech and censorship in nations pose as the final dimensions.

For the second research questions, international students (from the same school) were interviewed in two separate focus group settings. The total number of participants was 7, with 4 male and 3 female. The first group, comprised of Eastern European students, included a Russian student and Bulgarian student. Both were female. The second group included 5 Chinese students. Refer to appendix C to view the questions asked. The questions asked were meant to account for their internet experiences in their native country as well as others they know at home. Opinions were taken of how internationalized domain names may affect their internet viewing experiences as well as that of others in their respective home countries.

Measurement and Analysis for Research Question #1

Students responded to twenty-four Likert-type items. See appendix A for a duplicate of the survey and appendix B for the results. The appendix includes the raw data as well as a percentage breakdown and standard deviation.

Analysis for Research Question #2

In the first focus group, the respondents stated that younger individuals in their respective home countries have largely been able to easily adapt to the current setup. Many already know and understand English to some degree and are able to learn, especially because they are younger. Older generations, however, may have greater difficulty because of the language barrier. Foreign internet users are often able to use keyboards with English-alphabet characters on them. The capability enables users to type in ASCII characters.

In the second focus group, respondents stated that many individuals are learning English and that navigation of the web is not particularly constrained. They emphasized that many are learning English beginning very early in school. Students learn English in primary school in many cases. Unlike the previous group, keyboards contain only ASCII characters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question #1

The first research question concerns the attitudes of American Internet users towards a multilateral approach to internet governance. Respondents generally supported the move towards a multilateral approach, but not simply for the sake of helping internet end-users (as we will see). The reasons for supporting international cooperation run deeper than simply supporting foreign internet users.

In general, 79.1% of respondents supported the general practice of international cooperation towards matters that affect everyone (M = 5.29, SD = 1.85). However, only 45.3% of respondents leaned towards not trusting individual countries in solving global matters (M = 4.11, SD = 1.96). International cooperation is a positive arrangement, but unilateral approaches do not pose as that great of a drop-off. While respondents appreciate the value of a democratic approach, some aspects of unilateralism are not unattractive.

A distinction is made between who or what specifically gains influence. There are the governments of the world, and there are also the people for which they represent. 74.8% of respondents felt that governments do not always reflect the best interests of its citizens (M = 2.53, SD = 3.16). When asked about why multilateralism is important, 58.3% of respondents said it was because the end-users are entitled to representation (M = 4.55, SD = 1.57). This contrasts to multilateralism for the sake of foreign governments' entitlement to equal influence over internet governance where only 38.8% of respondents agreed (M = 4.14, SD = 1.8). The figures suggest that Americans feel that foreign peoples are entitled to fair representation.

When we consider authoritarian governments, attitudes towards those nations' rights do change a little, but the information is unclear. When asked directly about Iran and China, 51.8% of respondents favored their equal involvement (M = 4.35, SD = 1.73) with 23.7% being unsure. When asked about authoritarian governments in general, many hesitated to agree to their entitlement to equal influence (M = 4.32, SD = 1.64) with 43.9% in favor,

33.8% uncertain, and only 1.4% strongly agreeing to the statement. 46.8% of respondents seconded this feeling by meekly disagreeing that not all governments are entitled to manage the internet (M = 3.71, SD = 2.21) (note the high standard deviation). When the questions were framed in a freedom of speech light, 45.3% respondents narrowly felt that countries who limit freedom of speech should still be given authority (M = 3.71, SD = 2.21) (note the high standard deviation). The wide distribution reflects the uncertainty on the issue. These countries who impose restrictions on freedom of speech domestically caused concern for 61.2% of participants (M = 4.50, SD = 1.77). However, 59.0% of respondents believed that, despite the risks, all countries need to be equally involved in managing the web (M = 4.52, SD = 1.64). The results show an ambivalence and cognitive dissonance between the rights of authoritarian nations and the transnational influence they could potentially gain.

In general, respondents supported the inclusion of US legal values when crafting and designing appropriate internet governance policies. 71.9% of respondents strongly supported no freedom of speech impositions on the internet (M = 4.94, SD = 1.62). The sentiment was echoed in a follow-up question with 77.0% agreeing (M = 5.17, SD = 1.52). When asked about US legal values, 60.4% of respondents favored the reflection of American legal principles upon internet governance (M = 4.76, SD = 1.62). This same attitude was echoed in a follow-up question with 56.1% agreeing (M = 4.46, SD = 1.86). 65.5% of respondents felt that those experiencing censorship and limits to free speech are not receiving the full benefit of the internet (M = 4.95, SD = 1.62). In addition, 49.6 the population felt that those people(s) should be protected and "liberated" from those restrictions (M = 4.35, SD = 1.73). Overall, respondents were inclined to side with the American legal principles and ideals and felt (to a lesser degree) that it would benefit internet users to have fewer restrictions.

The results of the respondents, so far, indicate that international cooperation is generally ideal for solving global problems. The reason has less to do with the governments themselves, but the people they represent. It is the people(s) of other nations that the respondents are concerned. When considering authoritarian governments, their inclusion in the international democratic processes was significant to a lesser extent. Their censorship practices not only caused concern to the respondents, but they also felt that the internet end-users of those

nations deserve what they consider to be better. The freedom of speech legal value in the United States resonated heavily with respondents. This occurred to the extent that half of respondents believed people(s) living in authoritarian governments should be "liberated." The common concern for the American respondents was the internet end-users of other nations. While governments were felt to be entitled to equal involvement (with authoritarian governments being a thornier issue), the people and their representation was most significant. However, participants responded to the last question in contradiction to this conclusion. The last question reads "the fact that most internet users are non-Americans affects your opinion regarding the democratization of internet governance." Respondents did not seem to care too much about there being far more international users than American ones. 33.8% disagreed with the statement (M = 3.74, SD = 2.23). This draws into question the significance of the interests of the international internet community (the end-users specifically). 27.3% were unsure and 33.8% were affected by the fact. The high standard deviation of 2.23 indicates that there was a wide difference of opinion. Respondents also showed a wide split regarding the cultural sensitivity of the US. 40.3% felt the US lack the ability make appropriate decisions while 32.4% felt the opposite way (M = 3.51, SD = 2.16). The wide distribution on whether or not the United Nations should take control mirrors the uncertainty felt by the respondents, with 24.5% unsure and the rest split between the two sides (M = 4.07, SD = 1.88).

The results of the survey show a support for both international cooperation and the United Nations, but matters become foggier when considering the actual treatment of internet governance. The fundamentals of democracy compelled respondents to sympathize for international representation, but felt cognitive dissonance regarding the actual application of multilateralism and the potential consequent effects.

Respondents naturally supported the notions of general international cooperation as it relates to global issues as well as freedom of speech regarding online content. However, there was a great deal of ambivalence felt regarding the practices of unilateralism. No conclusion could be reached, and when the US was identified as the unilateral player, respondents were more content with the notion. On the other hand, students did oppose the idea of the US

government disallowing other national governments from carrying influence. The idea of the US flexing its muscles does not bode well with participants. When considering the US freedom of speech legal values, respondents' views varied widely. Students viewed the imposition of legal values as more acceptable so long as it was according to US doctrine. However, students preferred overwhelmingly to have a cooperative internet governance organization when the question was phrased in a way to invoke deontological thoughts and sentiments.

The survey pitted the principles of freedom of speech against the right of authoritarian nations to have an influence in a democratic process. As indicated above, students naturally supported the ideas of an "open environment" and opposed censorship. Many also indicated that they felt the internet should reflect the US interpretations of freedom of speech. However, students largely did not wish for countries who limit their citizens' freedom of speech to be excluded from any form of democratic governance. At the same time, their sentiment led them to be concerned with the dangers of allowing equal authority. Moreover, they felt that internet users abroad who experience considerable censorship are not experiencing the fullest value the web has to offer.

From a consequential perspective, students were not content in losing control of the fate of internet freedom of speech. Still, the notions of entitlement and duty resonate with students. They believe that a multilateral approach is the "right thing." They may believe this because of the associations and connotations with democratic rule of law. The conception of democracy and representation plays a powerful role in influencing the sentiments of the respondents. When asked about whether or not the US must relinquish control, more responded in the affirmative when it was for the international end-users as opposed to being for the governments. Representation of internet users struck a chord with respondents and likely for its association with the fundamentals of democracy. The idea makes sense because their responses to the final question were scattered and very inconclusive. The question asked was whether or not the fact that most internet users are non-Americans influenced their opinion. The implication is that the actual representation of foreign internet end-users mattered less than the ideas of multilateralism and cooperation (democracy). Consequentially,

the most important issue to respondents regarded the content on the web and its security from censorship. In effect, the importance of web content to the respondents supersedes that of international users.

Research Question #2
The first focus group, consisting of both a Bulgarian student and a Russian student, discussed their use of the internet in their respective home countries. Internet users use keyboards that include both English-alphabet letters as well as their own. Users are able to type in website addresses independent of what script they may use. The type of keyboards was described as common in their countries.

In Russia, the respondent, who lives in Moscow, stated that many of those with internet access live in urban areas. Rural parts of the country, which compose over a quarter of the population, do not tend to have access. The Russian census shows that about 4.9% of the Russian population speaks English as a second-language (6,950,000 people). However, the respondent opined that access to the internet is not overly hindered for Russian internet users. The script in the address bar does not impede on internet browsing or navigation.

In Bulgaria, the respondent stated that many of the internet users tend to be younger and are quite able to navigate the web proficiently. She cited the youth of the internet crowd and how they are better able to "adapt" than their older counterparts. Bulgaria contains a high percentage of English-speakers compared to Russia. Around 20.5% of the population speak English as their "main language;" and of those, 87.6% spoke the language well (Multicultural affairs Branch and the Program Statistics and Monitoring Section of DIAC, 2006). Just as the Russian student did, she felt that the internet is not overly hindered for Bulgarian internet users. Sometimes website addresses are typed in phonetically. That is, the English letters are used but are sounded out to create words in Bulgarian.

In China, the four participants described the country as a growing English-speaking populace. According to the April 2006 edition of *The Economist*, "today the Chinese are obsessed with English. Anything up to a fifth of the population is learning the language" (The Economist Newspaper Ltd., 2006). The growth is likely attributed to English's significance in

conducting international business. Not long ago, primary schools began teaching English for nine-year-olds (lowered from twelve by the government), and "many eastern cities have begun teaching it at six" (The Economist Newspaper Ltd., 2006). The drive is to teach the language at younger and younger ages. In contrast, older generations who do not understand English as well are a rarity on the internet. Internationalized domain names, while felt to be "somewhat helpful," are not believed to be crucial. The largest concern is likely to be the digital divide where eastern, urban areas accommodate internet access far better than more rural, western regions. The lack of infrastructure is apparent in western China. Moreover, lower income brackets tend to have a lot less access to the web, according to participants.

While Chinese internet users may prefer their own native language, software already exists for which Chinese characters appear in the address bar. Keyboards only really exist in English, because the alphabets are too long and complicated for use with computers. Internet users, instead, become highly proficient with various software packages (like Microsoft Pinyin) that allow the conversion from English characters to Chinese ones.

Foreign officials hailed ICANN's internationalized domain names, but the short-term effects do not appear to have that great an impact, according to the interviewees' opinions. This idea runs counter to ones intuition. Nevertheless, the initiative will likely serve to placate foreign governments who are concerned with ICANN's viability. The IDNs certainly moderate the sense of linguistic imperialism, and they may even open doors for older generations overseas. As described in the interviews, according to the focus groups the younger generations are the ones who are best at navigating the web. Older generations may have trouble adapting to the technology, especially with language serving as an unwanted impediment.

Conclusion
Internationalization of the internet is paramount, and the democratization of ICANN (or any other organizational apparatus that could be created) will help achieve this goal. An improved internationalization of the internet will allow access to more users and, thus, expand cyberspace. The ongoing expansion of the web enhances its value as a communicative medium. JS Mills' marketplace of ideas thrives on unfiltered, unfettered, and untrammeled communication and diversity. By adding internet users, we unlock untapped potential in the

World Wide Web. In addition, we may better serve the greatest number with the greatest good (utilitarianism). These consequential arguments oblige ICANN to cultivate and develop an internet that maximizes expansion, which means removing any language barriers and expelling bias and favoritism.

In contrast, the deontological argument emphasizes the rights to other nations and the peoples they represent. The attitudes of Americans place more importance on the end-users. But how does sovereignty factor into the equation? And how do we interpret what is best for the people of the world? International cooperation is generally favored for its inherent democratic arrangement. Yet, the American attitude favors the US freedom of speech interpretation so much so that its imposition unto other societies is thought to be reasonable.

If censorship could become a powerful and pervasive issue (with multilateralism), then at some point the marketplace of ideas is damaged. The basis of the marketplace of ideas is for information to flow uninterrupted. What's more, if keeping internet governance out of the hands of authoritarian governments is important enough, then from a utilitarian perspective the US should retain control. The problem whittles down to what effect multilateralism will have on censorship.

Government accountability is another significant topic. The internet blackouts in Myanmar and China illustrate the manipulation of the media. Many consider government transparency to be a cornerstone in the legitimacy of any world government. Without an informed population, there is little else to keep a government in check except bureaucracy. Activism on the internet has become an important mode of communication that broadcasts messages with such speed, effectiveness, and ferocity that authoritarian nations of the world have much to monitor and fear.

Internationalized domain names will provide all peoples, independent of language, the means to communicate on the web. The free flow of information will enable societies to freely transmit their cultures to all parts of the globe. Hence, concerns over American cultural imperialism ought to quell.   The flow of information will not be as unidirectional in its flow and will mirror true globalization. While the short-term use of internationalized domain

names remains a question mark, older generations and future generations may be able to experience a better internet. Those future generations are not limited to those overseas. Again, a network effect exists on the web. More users lead to more value for everyone.

As for what ICANN can do to improve the internet as a global communicative medium, they can better incorporate international influence into their decision-making processes. While a nation like China could defect and erect their own internet, the remote chance leads us to understand that this World Wide Web should be governed by its the stakeholders.

The steps ICANN takes towards democratizing themselves and internationalizing the internet show signs of improvement on ICANN's part. Their ability to make progress in their shortcomings (as discussed at length by scholars abound) allows us to better understand the direction ICANN and internet governance is moving. The justification of ICANN's continued existence hinges upon its ability to be progressive. Otherwise, foreign governments will have every right and reason to grumble.

ICANN will continue to endure the challenges of internet governance. Their "international arbitration body" creates a practical and ideal precedent for which they may use to set standards that pass beyond the scope of their technical stewardship. Still, how does one define universal standards of morality? What do we look to in determining whether or not a policy is just or not? The answer is to incorporate an outside presence into the organization as much as possible. Without this practice, foreign government pressures will only intensify. The World Wide Web has grown too big for the US to assume dominion without challenge. The United States government, however, has little political drive to forfeit their authority. An unforeseen political trigger may sit dormant but, until then, internet governance remains under the auspices of the United States.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Data collection for the American attitudes survey posed a challenge. The topics discussed in the paper are esoteric and not common knowledge. To properly extract data from survey respondents, they had to be educated on the subjects at hand. Otherwise, respondents would inappropriately answer the questions. As a result, the beginning of the survey included an introductory summary of the appropriate material; however, the content in the summary is difficult to communicate effectively. This quick outline had to be exoteric. The effect may have left the brief summary overly simplistic and less complete. The actual questions may have suffered a similar fate as well. The content is difficult to communicate clearly without losing the respondents' comprehension of the questions asked. Some questions were eliminated because of their complexity while others were "dumbed down." The issues faced in crafting the survey may have damaged the ability for proper measurement of the given questions.

Very little preexisting data exists regarding the first research question. As a result, much of the research may be characterized as explorative. It creates more questions than answers regarding the major factors that influence American sentiments towards internet governance.

The second research question is concerned with internationalized domain names, which have not been fully implemented yet. Since they have not taken effect, it is impossible to accurately measure whether or not their presence will improve the communicative value of the internet. In addition, the interviewed persons represent polyglots who speak English as well as their native language. Ideally, participants would not understand English, which would impose a greater constraint on their internet viewing habits. English is widely considered the lingua franca, but nevertheless, a non-English speaking population would have provided greater value to the study. Lastly, more participants should have been interviewed to reach more definitive conclusions. Only seven were included in focus groups.

Future Research

ICANN has existed for just over a decade, and at this juncture its fate as well as future US policy remains to be seen. The United States government has not offered to divest itself of its central role in internet governance, but as future events unfold there will always be more to discuss.

In regards to the first research question, additional studies may unearth some of the correlations between American sentiments towards internet governance and notions of democracy versus the effects on international end-users. Further research can explore these relationships to better understand the deontological sentiments towards improved democratization of internet governance. Also, the potential of censorship is unclear at present. Respondents would better reflect opinions if they had a firmer grasp of the implications of authoritarian governments gaining authority.

As for the second research question, the actual implementation of internationalized domain names will present an opportunity to better understand the effects of widening the linguistic horizons of the web. The international internet community is expanding at faster rates than in America, which will continue to drive the need to understand its effects overseas. Interviews and focus groups with non-English speakers can provide a great deal of information and deserves attention.

Many speak of the digital divide in regards to the inequalities of internet access between developed nations and emerging ones. One aspect of the study unearthed a disparity between generations. Older generations tend to speak English less. In the United States, older Americans have taken a liking to the Internet and are harnessing its capabilities. The impediment to older generations overseas is the language barrier and the ability to adapt new technology into their lives. The combination of the two hurdles poses a challenging obstacle for older generations to become well acquainted with the internet.

Lastly, the international arbitration committee, being the International Chamber of Commerce, warrants more in-depth research. The decision to use them and their relationship with ICANN is not discussed at length while it serves as the basis for policymaking. Their

existence in Paris, France serves as a significant geographical separation from the United

States and its government, but a follow-up on its actual role in the new TLD process would be

very meaningful.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – (American Attitudes Survey)

American Attitudes towards US Control of Internet Governance

The Internet began as a domestic medium exclusive to the United States. Consequently, various technical aspects of the web were managed solely by the United States government. These "technical aspects" were simple to administer and were based on US laws.

Since then, however, the Internet has expanded into an international phenomenon. The "technical aspects" of managing the Internet are no longer simple and are now referred to as "Internet Governance." There are more languages on the web, more spam and viruses, and more culturally sensitive content than ever before. Accordingly, foreign governments have been placing pressure upon the United States to change the way the Internet is governed and controlled.

It has been argued that the United States is able to foster an internet that reflects American legal values, with particular regard to freedom of speech and the freedom to offend. Moreover, the US is in a position to favor the economic interests of certain American businesses (such as telecom operators).

While surrendering power to the world may better democratize internet governance, it may compromise the current treatment of freedom of speech. Not every nation treats this liberty the same. Currently, the US imposes very few restrictions on Internet content, but other nations may or may not be so generous.

This survey is designed to examine your opinions about the control and governance of the internet.

Please indicate by circling the number to the right of the statement how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Use the scale below to guide your answer.

7 = Strongly Agree
6 = Agree
5 = Slightly Agree
4 = Unsure/Don't Know
3 = Slightly Disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

1. Countries should work together (such as in the UN) to solve problems that affect every nation

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. Internet laws should impose no restrictions on freedom of speech.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. Internet governance should reflect US legal values.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. Individual countries cannot be trusted to ensure the appropriateness of solutions to global matters.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. Authoritarian governments are entitled to equal involvement.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. The US should not allow international influence when managing the Internet.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. The internet should represent an open environment where freedom of speech is not hampered.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. The internet should strictly follow the values of the American interpretation on the freedom of speech.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. International internet users who are subject to surveillance and censorship are not experiencing the full benefit of the internet.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. A single nation should not have the capability to knock out the internet in another country.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

11. The internet is a global phenomenon, and while it was born and developed in the US, it should be managed by the United Nations.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. The US should retain control even though it may not be as legally and culturally sensitive

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Nations such as Iran and China deserve equal involvement in the governance of the Internet as the US

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Countries with limits to freedom of speech should not be given any authority regarding internet governance.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Countries with limits to freedom of speech cause concern because they may affect what is on the Internet

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Despite the risks in damaging the internet's status as an open network, all countries need to be equally involved in managing the web.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Not all governments of the world are entitled to manage the Internet

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. The US has an obligation to relinquish its authority because foreign governments are entitled to equal influence

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. The US has an obligation to relinquish its authority because foreign peoples are entitled to representation

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. What a government wants always reflects the best interests of its citizens

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. You greatly value the openness of the internet despite its susceptibility to spam, hacking, viruses, and crime.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. All governments should have equal involvement governing the Internet

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. International internet users who are subject to surveillance and censorship should be "liberated" and given fewer restrictions.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

24. The fact that most internet users are non-Americans affects your opinion regarding the democratization of internet governance.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

25. What is your sex?   Male   Female

26. How old are you?   ____ years old

27. Do you consider yourself to be American? Yes   No

Appendix B – (Survey Results)

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Slightly Disagree**	**Unsure/Don't know**	**Slightly Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Avg**
				Survey Results				
1	13	4	9	3	24	47	39	5.29
2	3	14	12	10	39	43	18	4.94
3	6	10	7	32	27	47	10	4.76
4	6	20	26	24	32	26	5	4.11
5	6	6	19	47	31	28	2	4.32
6	14	33	36	12	31	8	5	3.41
7	2	10	14	6	34	51	22	5.17
8	9	11	20	21	37	27	14	4.46
9	2	12	13	21	33	32	26	4.95
10	1	7	7	4	16	59	45	5.76
11	6	12	33	34	25	27	2	4.07
12	19	7	30	32	34	10	1	3.51
13	8	8	18	33	43	23	6	4.35
14	12	19	32	34	26	9	7	3.71
15	9	7	22	16	50	23	12	4.50
16	8	4	19	26	49	25	8	4.52
17	8	20	37	29	33	10	2	3.70
18	8	10	17	50	32	18	4	4.14
19	7	5	12	34	50	23	8	4.55
20	47	35	22	13	17	3	2	2.53
21	2	2	11	10	23	45	46	5.65
22	10	5	24	29	39	24	8	4.34
23	7	9	19	35	37	26	6	4.35
24	15	22	17	38	29	13	5	3.74

Gender		
	Response Frequency	**Response Count**
Male	41.2%	58
Female	58.8%	81

Age and Nationality	
Average Age	20.61
American	100%

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Unsure/Don't know	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	SD
Survey Results Percentage Breakdown								
1	9.40%	2.90%	6.50%	2.20%	17.30%	33.80%	28.10%	1.85
2	2.20%	10.10%	8.60%	7.20%	28.10%	30.90%	12.90%	1.62
3	4.30%	7.20%	5.00%	23.00%	19.40%	33.80%	7.20%	1.62
4	4.30%	14.40%	18.70%	17.30%	23.00%	18.70%	3.60%	1.96
5	4.30%	4.30%	13.70%	33.80%	22.30%	20.10%	1.40%	1.64
6	10.10%	23.70%	25.90%	8.60%	22.30%	5.80%	3.60%	2.46
7	1.40%	7.20%	10.10%	4.30%	24.50%	36.70%	15.80%	1.52
8	6.50%	7.90%	14.40%	15.10%	26.60%	19.40%	10.10%	1.86
9	1.40%	8.60%	9.40%	15.10%	23.70%	23.00%	18.70%	1.62
10	0.70%	5.00%	5.00%	2.90%	11.50%	42.40%	32.40%	1.47
11	4.30%	8.60%	23.70%	24.50%	18.00%	19.40%	1.40%	1.88
12	13.70%	5.00%	21.60%	23.00%	24.50%	7.20%	0.70%	2.16
13	5.80%	5.80%	12.90%	23.70%	30.90%	16.50%	4.30%	1.73
14	8.60%	13.70%	23.00%	24.50%	18.70%	6.50%	5.00%	2.21
15	6.50%	5.00%	15.80%	11.50%	36.00%	16.50%	8.60%	1.77
16	5.80%	2.90%	13.70%	18.70%	35.30%	18.00%	5.80%	1.64
17	5.80%	14.40%	26.60%	20.90%	23.70%	7.20%	1.40%	2.11
18	5.80%	7.20%	12.20%	36.00%	23.00%	12.90%	2.90%	1.8
19	5.00%	3.60%	8.60%	24.50%	36.00%	16.50%	5.80%	1.57
20	33.80%	25.20%	15.80%	9.40%	12.20%	2.20%	1.40%	3.16
21	1.40%	1.40%	7.90%	7.20%	16.50%	32.40%	33.10%	1.45
22	7.20%	3.60%	17.30%	20.90%	28.10%	17.30%	5.80%	1.8
23	5.00%	6.50%	13.70%	25.20%	26.60%	18.70%	4.30%	1.73
24	10.80%	15.80%	12.20%	27.30%	20.90%	9.40%	3.60%	2.23

Appendix C – (Interview/Focus group Questions)

Name

Age

Home Country

Primary language

Script

Is it roman based?

What sort of internet access do you have at home?

　　　What sort of internet access do others have? Friends, Family?

Would you describe yourself and others as frequent internet users (at home)?

Do others you know also speak English? How common is it in your country?

When you search the internet at home, what letters are on the keyboard? For others?

When at home, in what language do you search the internet?

　　　And others you know?

In the address bar, do the letters appear in your home language? English? Both?

　　　Is this the case for others? And are there any alternatives?

Does this pose as an impediment for yourself or others you know?

　　　In particular, what about non-English speakers?

Would you prefer the option of viewing the internet in your language script?

　　　Do you think others would prefer the same?

Are all web pages you find (which are in English) accessible in your home language?

　　　Can they be accessed by typing in the address bar in your home language's script?

Is the internet less valuable to non-English speakers because not all of the content may be accessed?

<u>REFERENCES</u>

Astor, M. (2007, November 13). US control on Web takes center stage. *Houston Chronicle* , p. 1.

Cukier, K. N. (2005). Who Will Control the Internet. *Foreign Affairs* , 2-3.

Galeota, J. (2004). *Cultural Imperialism: An American Tradition.* Retrieved 2 2009, from The Humanist: http://www.thehumanist.org/humanist/articles/essay3mayjune04.pdf

Gohring, N. (2007, 10 1). *Internet Blackout in Myanmar Stalls Citizens Reporting*. Retrieved 12 2008, from InfoWorld: http://www.infoworld.com/t/networking/internet-blackout-in-myanmar-stalls-citizen-reporting-790

Gonsalves, A. (2008, September 26). *China Overtakes US in Number of Broadband Lines*. Retrieved November 16, 2008, from InformationWeek: http://www.informationweek.com/news/services/data/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=210604264

IANA. (n.d.). *IANA Report on Delegation of Eleven Evaluative Internationalised Top-Level Domains*. Retrieved January 19, 2009, from IANA: http://www.iana.org/reports/2007/testetal-report-01aug2007.html

ICANN. (n.d.). Retrieved from ICANN.

IDNNews. (2008, June 22). *Cyrillic names many enlarge number of Russian Internet Domains*. Retrieved November 14, 2008, from IDNNews.

Internet World Stats. (2009). *Internet Usage Statistics*. Retrieved 02 2009, from Internet World Stats: http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Internet World Stats. (2009). *Internet World Users by Language*. Retrieved 2 2009, from Internet World Stats: http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats7.htm

ISIS International-Manila. (2006, 04 3). *US Retains Control of the Internet*. Retrieved 2 2009, from ISIS International-Manila: http://www.isiswomen.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=80&Itemid=204

John Paolillo, D. P. (2005). *Measuring Linguistic Diversity on the Internet.* Paris: UNESCO.

Kim, S. (1998). Cultural Imperialism on the Internet. *The Edge: E-Journal of Intercultural Relations* , Vol. 1 (4).

King, I. (2004). Internationalising Internet Governance: Does ICANN have a Role to Play? *Information & Communications Technology Law* , 3.

Klensin, J. C. (2004, 9). *Internationalizing Top-Level Domain Names: Another Look*. Retrieved 11 2008, from Internet Society: http://www.isoc.org/briefings/018/

Liptak, A. (2008, June 12). *Unlike others, US Defends Freedom to Offend in Speech*. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/12/us/12hate.html

McCarthy, K. (2006, August 16). *ICANN awarded net adminstration until 2011*. Retrieved January 4, 2009, from The Register: http://www.theregister.co.uk/2006/08/16/icann_awarded_iana/

Mueller, M. (2007, November 5). Net Neutrality as Global Principle for Internet Governance. Syracuse, NY, USA.

Mueller, M. (2005, November 1). Political Oversight of ICANN: A Briefing for the WSIS Summit. Syracuse, NY, USA.

Multicultural affairs Branch and the Program Statistics and Monitoring Section of DIAC. (2006). *Community Information Summary.* Retrieved 2 2009, from Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship: http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-summ/_pdf/bulgaria.pdf

RedOrbit. (2008, 6 28). *How Global Should the Internet Be?* Retrieved 08 2008, from
RedOrbit:
http://www.redorbit.com/news/technology/1447812/how_global_should_the_internet_
be/

Shiels, M. (2009, 3 25). *China Criticised over YouTube*. Retrieved 3 2009, from BBC News:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/7962718.stm

The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition. (2005). *Cultural
Imperialism*. Retrieved 4 9, 2009, from Dictionary.com:
http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cultural%20imperialism

The China Daily. (2005, 03 21). *France Plans anti-US 'counter-offensive' online*. Retrieved
01 2009, from The China Daily: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-
03/21/content_426856.htm

The Economist Newspaper Ltd. (2006, 4 15). Business: English beginning to be spoken here;
The language business in China. *The Economist* , p. 70.

USATODAY. (2005, November 15). UN control of Internet? An idea for the 'delete' file. *USA
TODAY* , pp. 1-2.

Williams, M. (2007, 9 28). *Internet link raises visibility of Myanmar Protests*. Retrieved 11
2008, from InfoWorld: http://www.infoworld.com/t/networking/internet-link-raises-
visibility-myanmar-protests-728