

Public Opinion and the Internet

Peter Murphy

Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

INTRODUCTION

The development of the “World Wide Web” has had a significant impact on the formation of public opinion in democratic societies. This impact, though, has not been exactly that predicted by early 1990s prophets of the Web, who expected a decentralization of traditional mass media. If anything, the easy accessibility of the Web-enabled Internet (hereafter “the Net”) has extended the audience reach of traditional network media. Despite this, the Net is fundamentally changing the nature of public opinion.

One should be wary of thinking of this change as a technology-enabled extension of the 19th-century liberal public. In the liberal view, the Net is a difficult-to-control free speech medium. It engenders a babble of voices devoted to persuading citizens and governments of the merits and otherwise of laws and policies. Because the Web’s infrastructure of servers is global, dictatorial, or even legal control of it is difficult to achieve. This is especially true for governments that want to encourage the pragmatic benefits of computer-mediated commerce.

Yet, to see the Net simply as a free speech medium does not do full justice to its nature. It began life as a powerful document delivery system, and, in important ways, its long-term impact on public opinion derives from that fact. The Web leveraged existing inter-networked computing to enable a new way of creating, collecting, storing, transforming, and disseminating documents and information objects. The frothy activity of instant commentary and interest group campaigning that the Net facilitates disguises the extent to which the logic of the public sphere is undergoing a long-term paradigmatic shift shaped by its origins as a document archive.

BACKGROUND

The architect of this dynamic document archive was Tim Berners-Lee (Berners-Lee, 1999; Naughton, 1999). In 1980, Berners-Lee began work as consult-

ant at CERN, the international particle research body located near Geneva. CERN was a “city of turnover”. Its principal social characteristic was a transient population. Visiting physicists who came and went did much of the center’s experimentation. Scientists on average stayed two years. The problem that resulted was how to maintain good documentation tracking when staff turnover was so high. Berners-Lee set out to solve this problem.

His first attempt was a program called ENQUIRE (1980), which he called a “memory substitute”. He filled documents with words which, when highlighted, would lead to other documents. This was similar to the Apple Macintosh HyperCard. This application in its turn borrowed the hypertext concept from Ted Nelson (Nelson, 1992). Hypertext conceived information as connection or linkage. Berners-Lee adapted this idea to create the beginnings of a publicly accessible archive of documents. The archive was initially restricted to CERN. In 1989, however, Berners-Lee conceived a plan for a universal document system. Universal meant global. The idea was to use a mix of hypertext and networked computing to link all documents and information objects in the world. The idea of a universal system was a conceptual break-through. A universal system meant there would be no central control or source of information—whether in the sense of a centralized undemocratic hierarchy or else a democratic hub-and-spoke network. Universal also meant the potential integration of all information systems.

Berners-Lee had another powerful idea. He thought that a universal information system should mean not only universal access to and retrieval of documents but also the universal capacity to publish documents. He insisted (against the opposition of peers) that this should be a system in which anyone using a hypertext editor could publish a linked document. The hypertext editor was the forerunner of the HTML editor. Andries van Dam had created the first functional hypertext editor in 1967 at Brown University.

In 1990, Berners-Lee got support from CERN senior managers for what had been to that date

virtually a private project. He created a program called a “browser” that provided a virtual “window” through which a user saw a Web of linked resources on the existing “inter-net” (i.e., the existing inter-network of networked computers that had grown up since the 1970s). His small team also created a “Web server”, based on the client-server model. He envisaged a system in which information would be stored on networked computers called servers. Client programs (browsers) running on other networked computers would access these servers.

How would the information be extracted from these servers? One option was to use existing technology such as TELNET or FTP. A second more powerful idea was that of the “inter-face”. This concept came from the hypertext community. An inter-face was a “window” that displayed the structure of the virtual space of linked texts. Originally, node-link diagrams represented this structure. The first browsers were not graphical. Graphical interfaces came later. Marc Andressen’s 1993 Mosaic browser was the first with the standard graphical interface of windows, graphics, and point and click functionality.

Berner-Lee’s desire for universality meant that he had to ensure that public information on any networked computer anywhere in the world could be accessed through the browser. To achieve this end, Berners-Lee devised a set of protocols by which different machines could talk to each other and exchange information. One protocol specified the location of information. It was like an IP address. A second protocol for information exchange between machines was modeled on FTP. This was the HTTP (Hypertext Transport Protocol). A third protocol established a uniform way of structuring documents: Hypertext Mark-up Language (HTML). HTML was based on SGML (Standard Generalized Mark-up Language) already used in the electronic publishing world. It provided conventions for attaching tags to pages.

CRITICAL ISSUES: FROM PEERS TO AUTOPOIESIS

The result of Berners-Lee’s architecture was a cheap, quick, and reliable system for accessing, retrieving, and publishing documents. Any person with access to

the Internet in principle could look at any document stored on a Web server (unless it resided on a secure server where access was intentionally limited). A person with some Web server space could publish any documents they liked on the Internet, as long as they had some simple knowledge of HTML page creation.

What followed from this were two major consequences for public opinion. The first was that anyone with a relatively simple set of tools could publish their own opinions. On the Web, these opinions were accessible to anyone anywhere in the world with access to a computer and an Internet Service Provider.

Computer-mediated universal access and self-publishing created a new kind of public sphere. They also created a new set of justice and equity problems. Not everyone can afford access, and certainly not unlimited access, to the Internet. Indeed most of the world does not have a telephone connection, let alone a computer or an ISP account. But, then, also most of the world has never participated in public opinion formation of any kind. In the still limited number of countries where there is a history of strong public spheres, programs sponsored by governments and private foundations emerged in order to overcome access inequalities. Widespread provision of computing by companies and educational institutions also facilitated access to the new digital public as well. “Stealing time” from institutions for public and private Net activity emerged in the well-endowed democracies as a “quasi entitlement”—creating dilemmas for organizations as to “when and where and how” to encourage or discourage such tacit activity.

In democratic societies with long-established publics, and a correlative strong propensity to create intellectual wealth, virtually all social groups and classes have directly or indirectly benefited from the increasing access to information made possible by the Net. At the other end of the political spectrum, the Net has posed significant dilemmas for dictatorial governments. Their first instinct has been to censor Web materials. However, censorship is difficult to apply to the Net, because material is published on thousands of web servers in hundreds of countries. Dictatorial states instead discourage access to computer hardware, the setting up of ISPs, and the local publication of sites. However, as the Net is also a major scientific and commercial medium, with implications for trade and military science, such controls also hurt a state’s economic and technology performance.

4 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/public-opinion-internet/17340

Related Content

Discovering Multimedia Services and Contents in Mobile Environments

Z. Wang and H. Koubaa (2008). *Multimedia Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 116-128).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/discovering-multimedia-services-contents-mobile/27077

Internet Privacy from the Individual and Business Perspectives

Tziporah Stern (2005). *Encyclopedia of Multimedia Technology and Networking* (pp. 475-479).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/internet-privacy-individual-business-perspectives/17286

Measuring and Mapping the World Wide Web through Web Hyperlinks

Mario A. Maggioni, Mike Thelwall and Teodora Erika Uberti (2009). *Encyclopedia of Multimedia Technology and Networking, Second Edition* (pp. 887-893).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/measuring-mapping-world-wide-web/17495

Network Mobility and Mobile Applications Development

Rui Rijo, Nuno Veiga and Silvio Bernardes (2011). *Handbook of Research on Mobility and Computing: Evolving Technologies and Ubiquitous Impacts* (pp. 487-501).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/network-mobility-mobile-applications-development/50607

Virtual Learning Communities

Stewart T. Fleming (2005). *Encyclopedia of Multimedia Technology and Networking* (pp. 1055-1063).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-learning-communities/17367