

# User Rights (2013)

In “Turing Complete User” (October 2012), I stated that the development of the Invisible Computer results in the creation of an Invisible User. We need to keep both the term and the idea of the user alive, to insure that users – those who use a system they haven’t developed – don’t lose either their rights or the opportunity to protect them. In the article I only briefly mention what these user rights could be.

Now I’d like to invite computer users to elaborate and suggest points (long or short) that should be included in a Bill Of Computer Users Rights. Please participate! At the moment we need to collect varying opinions. Don’t think that it’s only about big issues like free software or data privacy. Demand to have a back button, if its absence infringes upon your rights as a computer user!

[userrights.contemporary-home-computing.org](http://userrights.contemporary-home-computing.org)

olia lialina, 2013-10-04

**Editorial note:** *The following thread is taken from [userrights.contemporary-home-computing.org](http://userrights.contemporary-home-computing.org).*

*The contributors’ original writing style and form of the comments have been preserved.*

## ***We, Computer Users, demand the right to ...***

### **UNDO**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-06

agree 47 disagree 1

UNDO was a gift from developers to users, a luxury a programmable system can provide. It became an everyday luxury with the first GUI and turned into a standard for desktop OSs to follow. Things changed with the arrival of smart phones: neither Android nor Windows phone nor Blackberry provide a cross application alternative to CTRL+Z (the iPhone gave to its users "shake to undo"). What is the logic of these devices' developers? Not enough space on the nice touch surface for undo button; idea that users should follow some exact path (app logic) that would lead somewhere anyway; promise that the "experience" (interface) is so smooth that you won't even need this function.

Should we believe it and give up? NO!

There are at least 3 reasons

- 1st: UNDO is one of not many generic ("stupid") commands. It follows a convention without sticking its nose into user's business.
- 2nd: UNDO has a historical importance. It marks the beginning of the period when computers started to be used by people who didn't program them, the arrival of the real user and the naive user. The function was first mentioned in the 1976 IBM research report "Behavioral Issues in the Use of Interactive Systems" by Lance A. Miller and John C. Thomas. They outlined the necessity to provide future users with UNDO: "the benefit to the user in having – even knowing – of a capability to withdraw a command could be quite important (e.g. easing the acute distress often experienced by new users, who are worried about 'doing something wrong')."
- 3rd: UNDO is the border line between the Virtual and the Real World everybody is so keen to grasp. You can't undo IRL. If you can't undo it means you are IRL or on Android.

And apart from it, UNDO is the only time traveling technology we've got for the moment. Bit by bit into the past!

## securely delete my history

suggested by [no name] on 2013-10-11

agree 31 disagree 1

comment by **despens** on 2013-10-12: I think this right is formulated too specialized. The real demand should be that all data is exposed to the user in an universal, manageable way, for example the file system (see the right to access the file system and organize my data), preferably in clear text format.

If the browser's history is saved in `~/browser/history.txt` there is no need to demand a function especially for the deletion of this data. In fact, many more things than deletion could be made, for example syncing, manipulation, etc. This is not possible if software is putting everything into databases that require extra knowledge to handle.

## have an "export" function

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-07

agree 28 disagree 0

I borrow it from the talk "Where are the Files" Jason Scott gave in Stuttgart in 2012 <http://www.merz-akademie.de/lectures/where-are-the-files>. He argues (1:06:50) that you should never ever import anything to services which are unclear about their export responsibilities. Probably this point should become a sub-point of own data right.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: this export function shall also be based on Open Document or Open File Format specifications.

## use free software on your own computer

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-04

agree 27 disagree 0

I took it from The Free Software Foundation <http://www.fsf.org/about/> "use free software on your own computer (and advocate within your business or community for others to adopt it)".

Comment by **davidm** on 2013-12-16: This is really the basic stepping stone on which the rest of the manifesto should rest. But free software must also follow the other rules we decide.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: this right is often violated by the systems that don't let users to install software outside AppStores (or intentionally make this process too complicated for inexperienced users)

## ignore updates

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-14

agree 24 disagree 0

No question, it is vital to update. If there is anything that is in the nature of new media it is updatability. And there are many cases when you are longing for an update and would rather demand the right to update 24/7. At the same time users are forced to update, though newer version doesn't mean better version, and better version doesn't mean that it is better for everybody.

Quality is not the only issue. Another argument against forced updates is that they lead to alienation, because users are denied the chance to get attached to a particular program or operating system.

Comment by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-16: The cardinal rule of critical systems is "don't update willy-nilly." If my main machine did an update that killed something, while I was on deadline, oooooooooohhhhhh angry. It's also smart to avoid .0 releases, because these days beta-testing often happens in the marketplace.

Comment by **Selbylouwho** on 2013-10-17: And what about the right to ignore the "agree to these terms and conditions"?

Comment by **San Nuvola** on 2013-10-20: Terms and conditions are merely a way for website owners to discharge responsibility on the one hand, and to maintain banning/moderation power over the users. Maybe it's better to empower users by letting them impose their own terms of usage – i.e. usage as active praxis rather than something conceded by platforms. Or to negotiate them (this is applicable to updates as well, in the general tension towards user rights).

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-12-09: After updating my Android, I want to add: no auto updates, no auto back-ups, no auto awesomeness.

Comment by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23: We like to be able to stick to older versions of our software but rage about inability of upgrading hardware.

## see the URL from which content is displayed

suggested by **Danny Birchall** on 2013-10-07

agree 22 disagree 0

“Trust” in a browser context extends beyond the mechanical issuing and acceptance of HTTPS certificates. Through years of use, we have learned to read URLs as human statements and intentions of ownership and architecture, from the top level domain to the directory structure. Typically, technocratic content “management” systems have obscured these, to the detriment of the user: a well-formed URL is the first element of metadata about a web page that a user encounters, and it tells us something. Link shorteners like bit.ly initially obscure a URL, but the browser leads you to it eventually. Inside an app, things are different. Because web pages returned natively from the web remain an important source of structured information, many apps include an embedded browser function to display data directly from the WWW. Many omit the browser’s “location” bar, and thus obscure the source of the information. The user’s well-honed URL-reading skills are ignored, and the larger context of the web replaced with the narrow context of the app. A URL attached to content makes that content both addressable and accountable. All web-based content should come with its URL attached.

Comment by **despens** on 2013-10-07: Firefox on Android doesn’t show URLs by default. At least it can be changed via a setting [http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/use-awesome-screen-search-firefox-android#w\\_how-to-set-firefox-to-always-show-the-url-in-the-address-bar](http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/use-awesome-screen-search-firefox-android#w_how-to-set-firefox-to-always-show-the-url-in-the-address-bar)

Comment by **Brendan Howell** on 2013-12-18: Indeed, and if you ever open the network tab in the developer view for some crappy big media web site it can be shocking to see all the tracking, ads and API crap that gets loaded from dozens of different servers.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: see type of protocol being used – modern browsers tend to remove 'http://' part of URLs

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2014-02-17: URL is a weapon and the key to survival online. Read for example Addie Wagenknecht's FREE INTERNET FOREVER!!!! <http://fffff.at/freewifi/> "When you try to load a page, the router will automatically redirect you to the login page: look at the URL, because from there you can see which system the airport is using."

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2014-05-01: Chrome is removing URL <http://soylentnews.org/article.pl?sid=14/05/01/1428233&from=rss>

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2014-05-02: <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=7678580> good discussion under the post by Paul Irish "This is a new UI experiment that's deployed to a small fraction of users. We're looking at a few key metrics to see if this change is a net positive for Chrome users."

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2015-03-15: Seeing the actual URL is off by default and filed under 'Advanced'. <http://t.co/ltAvtdBcBs> <https://twitter.com/despens/status/576168318903652352>

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2018-10-09: <https://www.wired.com/story/google-wants-to-kill-the-url/> "Whatever we propose is going to be controversial. But it's important we do something, because everyone is unsatisfied by URLs. They kind of suck."

## **own data**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-04

agree 21 disagree 0

It is the #1 demand of the User Data Manifesto by ownCloud founder Frank Karlitschek <http://userdatamanifesto.org/> "The data that someone directly or indirectly creates belongs to the person who created it." The manifesto suggests 7 further points to regulate the relation between users and clouds.

Comment by **despens** on 2013-10-11: Frank's follow-up points define this more clearly what exactly is meant, he uses "ownership" as metaphor for a combination of knowledge and control: It is possible to find out everything about "my" data and to define what happens with it, without being at the mercy of somebody else. The manifesto's weakness is the spongy establishment of the user-data relation: "The data that someone directly or indirectly creates belongs to the person who created it." This makes the idea of ownership difficult, for example this could be an argument for DRM and surveillance architecture. In my opinion, digital culture is practices, not artifacts. Why not discuss processes instead of objects like files or "data" (as a "substance" that files or other digital objects are "made of"). Frank's manifesto would work better with ownership not as the foundation but the conclusion: Users should be able to \*do\* these seven things, if they can, we can call this ownership of data.

Comment by **hugo** on 2014-03-02: I share despens' concerns. I have worked with Frank on a version 2 of the manifesto. Unfortunately, he does not seem to want to change it any more... You can see my draft here <https://github.com/hugoroy/user-data-manifesto>.

## logout

suggested by **florian kuhlmann** on 2013-10-11

agree 19 disagree 0

It's always fine becoming a user, but it must also be always possible to become a #non-user again. for this reason, we need the right to logout.

Comment by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-11: Definitely – while logged in, my account is less secure. It is also possible for the service to track me and interact with other services while I am logged in.

Comment by **florian kuhlmann** on 2013-10-14: the right to logout implies also the concept of login whenever you want to and need to. and this right to login-and-logout implies not being kicked out of the system as a punishment for misbehavior.

## see the computer

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-04

agree 21 disagree 2

I see it as a fundamental right, though it won't be easy to advocate for it, because hardware and software industries will not give up the challenge to make computers as tiny as possible. Computer users are convinced as well that a good computer is one that is not visible or at least doesn't look like a computer. Myself, I don't plea for computers made huge and bulky again, at the same time, I believe that even when it is technologically possible to produce a totally invisible computer, the user should see that there is one. Seeing the computer is a necessary pre-condition for coming to the idea to ask "what is this computer doing?" and further questions.

Comment by **Danny Birchall** on 2013-10-07: Focusing on the materiality of computers distracts us from the understanding that power exists, and is constituted in, the network, as James Bridle points out.

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-07: Danny, I'm talking about visibility, not exactly the same as materiality. Don't know which of Bridle's texts exactly you quote, but I'm sure somebody who makes drones visible won't plea for invisible computer.

Comment by **Dan T.** on 2013-10-08: Well, I bought a new PC earlier this year, of the big heavy desktop variety (Windows 7, none of that Win8 crap) in the midst of all the web articles proclaiming the death of the PC, so I still stand for real solid visible computers myself.

Comment by **despens:** @Danny on 2013-10-11: If I see the computer, I can pull out the network cable or break off the antenna. :)

Comment by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23: See the computer your data is being processed on. Probably similar to a demand of less computation being done on "cloud" services. If application has some online functionality this software shall not be limited to function exclusively while online.

## **buy and install software outside "app stores"**

suggested by **Max** on 2013-12-17

agree 16 disagree 0



Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-04: Also to create and distribute software outside of "app stores"!

## **true anonymity**

suggested by **San Nuvola** on 2013-10-20

agree 17 disagree 1

Meaning

- a) the option to register, comment, interact, contribute content under non-identifiable or anonymous handles,
- b) the non-correlability of an IP with a handle, and of an IP with a physical person.

## **know explicitly what information is being retained due to my interaction with your service/website/network/whatever**

suggested by **Charlie Derr** on 2013-10-11

agree 16 disagree 0

Comment by **despens** on 2013-12-16: This demand is very difficult to fulfill because the routing of data on the Internet is extremely complex. There are so many points where some entity could make use of or manipulate any traffic, it is just overwhelming.

## **read source code**

suggested by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-10-12

agree 16 disagree 1

and by doing so study the software that we use

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-12: I would add, that it virtually means that source code should be readable, not just open/available.

Comment by **despens** on 2013-10-12: The border between developers and users is marked by the difference between those who can read, understand and manipulate source code and those who cannot. Generally readable source code is something that works fine for descriptive languages that do not execute (e.g. pure HTML and CSS). Once you enter the level of

turingcompleteness, this demand is misguided, because there is no fixed level of abstraction or meaningful standard on coding style. Instead it should be demanded that languages are available to users that are mostly descriptive and still very powerful, or that a system is based on a certain programming paradigm, for instance the LISP machine or smalltalk or, like the original concept of OLPC, python.

## **pause media indefinitely and be able to resume where I left off.**

suggested by **Dan T.** on 2013-10-08

agree 16 disagree 1

Not everyone has time to go all the way through some long piece of media (video, audio... even a text file!) in one session. It's nice if there's some way to hold your place until next time you return to it. Ancient media tend to be better at this than "modern, hi-tech" ones. A good old-fashioned paper book lets you insert a bookmark. An audio or video cassette will keep its place until you rewind it. Newer media tend to be worse at that. Embedded web audio/video has a tendency to reset, abort, time-out, or otherwise lose its place if you pause it and leave it open in a browser tab for extended periods. Even text articles left open in a browser will sometimes lose their place in "Ajaxy" sites full of gimmicky scripts, auto-refreshing, and the like. And don't get me started on BluRay disks, which manage to step backwards from the slightly-older DVD medium by using "sophisticated" techniques to defeat my DVD player's usual behavior of remembering its place in the current disc even if I power it down and resuming when I turn it back on; BluRays are a crapshoot where some of them will resume, some will ask me if I want to resume, and still others will just start over with the annoying ads. I wish all media gave me the chance to save my place and resume. (Netflix Streaming is actually pretty good in this regard, holding my place in multiple videos / video series.)

Comment by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-11: I also hate the way buffering has regressed recently. This makes it difficult to use media in the superior old way – if I want to re-watch a moment I just saw, I click earlier in the stream, and now it ALWAYS starts loading again from the spot I clicked, instead of re-playing the same file I already downloaded. Perhaps it's to do with i-frames and interpolation etc., but that's not my problem as a user... ;-) Cueing media is indeed important for teaching. Students get very distracted watching me fast-forward.

## choose none of the above

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-04

agree 15 disagree 0

I borrowed this line from the subtitle "You May Always Choose None of the Above" of the chapter "Choice" in Douglas Rushkoff's *Program or be Programmed*, 2010, p. 46. Rushkoff doesn't talk about it as a right, but sees it more as a way to protect yourself from the marketers. I see a big potential in turning this appeal into a demand: not to follow the logic of the database, or at least not to accept it is a given. Not to answer male or female, Visa or Mastercard, now or later. If this pattern would be accepted by software developers, it could lead to more ambiguity in design and more advanced interaction scenarios.

Comment by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-11: Force-quit is always an option. ;-) <http://xkcd.com/1197/> Guy Debord talks about the mania of bureaucracy, that if anyone discovers an option that is not on their menu, they must fight it to the death.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: not to have mandatory fields in web forms

## know whether my hardware will run free software

suggested by **hellekin** on 2013-12-05

agree 14 disagree 0

Hardware vendors usually don't get any profit from guaranteeing user's freedom, so they do not care about ensuring compatibility with free software. Worse, when you buy a computer, most will tell you "it's compatible with Linux", but they fail to understand that it's not enough to safeguard your freedom. The hardware should be labeled to tell whether it can (1) run a free software BIOS replacement (e.g., Coreboot); and (2) run all of its components without any binary blobs (e.g., 100% free firmware), as this is the only way to build trust into machines that will access our intimate thoughts and activity and be able to share that with third parties without our consent. Freedom requires free software requires free hardware.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: hardware incompatibilities are often caused by the lack of free firmwares provided by the hardware manufacturers. so perhaps it makes

sense to speak of the right "to free firmware released in timely fashion for every new hardware on the market"

Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-06: Perhaps vendors should be required to release a Free Software version of their firmware after a certain period of time?

## **participate in society without having to use a particular software, device or corporate web site**

suggested by **Brendan Howell** on 2013-12-09

agree 14 disagree 1

I should be able to participate in public discourse without having to use program X or web-platform Y. There should always be a way to participate without having to conform to some kind of commodity camaraderie. Public conversations should not be owned or controlled by one entity. (see AGPL)

Comment by **dauidak** on 2020-03-27: i support this because i don't want my name to be printed in Comic Sans. this is just wrong.

## **not be forced to use an app**

suggested by **Bendix** on 2014-04-29

agree 11 disagree 0

Users should not be forced to have multiple applications on their devices, instead of an easily combined version of this simple app. Example: Facebook tries to separate some elements from their app into a new app. The facebook-chat will soon be sepearated into a new app, the facebook-messenger. If you want to chat from your mobile device, you will be forced to install the messenger-app.

## **actually delete my account**

suggested by **elviapw** on 2013-10-28

agree 11 disagree 0

## a real keyboard (aka “hardkeys”)

suggested by **despens** on 2013-10-11

agree 13 disagree 2

... preferably with cursor and command/meta keys! A lot of great design has been sacrificed for design that looks good for the “third user”, a user that hasn’t bought a product yet (see <http://asktog.com/atc/the-third-user/>). The worst example is that it became virtually impossible to buy a phone with a QWERTY keyboard. Simple actions like searching, writing, editing, calculating, controlling became needlessly painful to execute, and it is increasingly painful to interact with people that use touch devices to create their communication and leave their choices to an auto correction algorithm. Keyboards became a symbol for old-fashioned, boring computing. Companies that produced rather well-designed phones with full keyboards already went bankrupt, are about to vanish completely, or are giving up on producing such devices. This is a regrettable development.

- The keyboard is the most powerful input device. Users can only be an equal in front of a computer if they are able to manipulate symbols adequately that control the computer. While a lot of effort is put into creating the illusion that computers work with images nowadays, they are still symbol processing machines. With symbol manipulation available, users can do magic (e.g. write a program), without it only the computer can do magic.
- Using a symbol system like the alphabet makes it possible to create any kind of human-to-human message with ease and any desired level of precision or ambiguity.
- Keyboards offer the simplest two-level interface: Novice users can orient themselves visually, if they grow to use certain features more often or with more detail, they can use precise keyboard combinations and shortcuts to execute functions that are present in their minds rather than the computer screen. Neither visible nor invisible gestures can offer this level of interaction, reliance on them removes almost all possibilities for increasing the mastery of users. It is just terrible to watch users performing the same clumsy gestures over and over again for doing things repeatedly.

- Only symbol based navigation like search makes it possible for users to handle very large amounts of data. Without such ordering systems and meaningful ways of interaction with them, users' options are limited to what fits onto the screen and into visual memory. Unable to define exactly what they mean on pure touch devices, users become dependent on algorithms guessing what they actually want to do or need to laboriously switch contexts for general procedures that would be considered trivial with richer input possibilities. This created an inflated market of "apps".
- An always present hardware keyboard allows for modeless meta commands, like copy/paste, select, undo, help, quit etc.

Comment by **Miranda** on 2015-12-12: I believe that keyboards are an excellent piece of hardware, but I do not think that the use of a keyboard is a fundamental right for a user. I think that Despens makes some good points, but that they are conflating the familiarity of developers and users when working with an input device with the inherent usefulness of an input device. Perhaps a more accurate way to describe this would be "the right to manipulate a system using tools with functionality rivaling the tools used by the system's developers". At the moment, that exclusively means "keyboards", but that might not be the case in the future. :)

## **have 6 months+ to grab my files before a hosting service shuts down**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2014-04-10

agree 10 disagree 0

I suggest half a year as a minimum, not because I personally think it is the right amount of time. This number is not backed up by any case study or user tests either. Half a year is what Yahoo "gave" to its users on the 23rd of April 2009 to take care about their files. Half a year is what the Archive Team got to mobilize people and bots to rescue the remains of the Welcome to my Home Page empire. As a tribute to their deed, in memory of these events 5 years ago and with the intention to exercise at least some digital cultural memory among developers of cool stuff – I suggest to set a 6 months (plus whatever amount of time) sunset period in every ToS users of online hosting services have to agree to when signing up.

Comment by **despens** on 2014-04-10: A service could announce "we guarantee a total sunset period of 2.5 Geocities", meaning 15 months.

## **symmetrical access**

suggested by **Baruch** on 2013-12-16

agree 10 disagree 0

I want to be able to learn as much about the companies and other entities providing web services as they might learn about me.

Comment by **A.D.** on 2018-11-15: In 2018 the upload to download ratio is 56KB/s / 800KB/s = 7%. It is similar even for faster connections. Is there a technical explanation? Isn't this broadcasting?

## **disconnect**

suggested by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-10-12

agree 10 disagree 0

while maintaining functionality autonomously and independently from the proverbial Cloud.

Comment by **hellekin** on 2013-12-05: YES! "Always on" is a fallacy, and one that fosters global surveillance, addiction, and dependability on centralized systems. When people are required to use Facebook, or have a phone to participate in society, those who don't are excluded. See also the concept of "eventually-connected networks" developed by Mocambos Networks' and Dyne hacker Vincenzo Tozzi, where communities that are excluded from the always-on Internet can still participate asynchronously to the electronic data network.

## **copy & paste**

suggested by **Aram Bartholl** on 2013-12-22

agree 9 disagree 0

To copy & paste content between programs is a very fundamental tool. Especially news apps and similar don't let you copy text any more, it's just the beginning...

## be un-Googable

suggested by **nancy mauro-flude** on 2013-10-13

agree 11 disagree 2

Comment by **despens** on 2013-10-13: This is already possible:

- via robots.txt <https://support.google.com/webmasters/answer/156449?hl=en>
- meta tags in HTML <https://support.google.com/webmasters/answer/93710?hl=en> It is important that this convention will be respected in the future.

Comment by **Brett O'Connor** on 2013-11-19 : Even with properly configured robots.txt it seems a website can appear in Google.

"How do I keep a robot off my server?" <http://www.robotstxt.org/faq/away.html>

## access the file system and organize my data.

suggested by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-11

agree 9 disagree 0

Sandboxing will hinder creative re-purposing of project files. Locking all your documents in app-specific interfaces prevents the serious user from managing projects in their own way. Proprietary structures like the apple home folder hinder portability of a user's data. Elimination of the finder / explorer altogether, as on tablets and phones, disempowers the user and creates a further gap between the user with computer literacy and the user without. This might even eliminate the power user and leave behind only the regular user and the programmer.

Comment by **despens** on 2013-10-12: Flick, what's wrong with the home folder? As far as I can tell, it works like a Unix home directory in the sense that all software stores their settings in there and it is easily portable to another Apple computer.

Comment by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-14: It is pretty portable to another Apple system, I agree. Never transferred a user folder except through Migration Assistant but it seems pretty cut and dried in theory. The home folder isn't so bad but the constant attempt to save



everything under "movies," "documents," "music," "pictures" must be chosen against every time the option comes up. Older apps default to where I've told them to, but newer apps increasingly default (unalterably) to the Mac naive-user organization, or, worse, to internal databases that will increasingly be inaccessible except through that app. Why would I want to organize a media project for a high school under "movies," "documents," "music," and "pictures," when it contains all these? Should I make project folders under "documents?" Should I keyword everything and then have smart folders that more or less reliably turn up everything related to that project (along with however many false positives)? So that's why I don't use it myself, others may obviously differ. When I'm teaching, and I want students to save their work for posterity, to bring home to Windows or Android land, etc, they have to root through several places to find all their files and put them on a CD or USB stick. Modern apps like Photo Booth store their images in a database, which means you either dig through that or remember to open up every app you've used on that computer and copy it off. I prefer them to have a folder on the desktop with their name on it, and save all their files there. Thus the output is "drag that folder to Toast, burn it, the end." I mean, if you import videos into iPhoto, those get stored in "pictures," not movies. You have to remember which program imported them in order to find them again – which seems like a distraction. I mean, how do you organize projects on Android? Is Google Drive suitable for that?

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: it's probably related to how many abstractions shall UI or software be based up on. My vote is for less abstractions and more actual understanding of inner workings of the systems we use.

## **have full control over the computing that my computer does.**

suggested by **The Unquux** on 2013-12-31

agree 8 disagree 0

In particular, this means ALL alterable software in it must be free.

## **have all data saved in clear text files**

suggested by **despens** on 2013-10-12

agree 10 disagree 2

Software is increasingly storing data in formats which are only machine-readable, for example databases. This makes it difficult for users to manage their own data. For example, chatlogs, browsing history, emails and calendar entries that are stored in databases or other binary formats can only be handled with either the software that created it or with lots of effort. Everything that can be saved as text should be saved as text, so that users can manipulate the files if the software doesn't meet their needs. They could delete their history not with a "delete history" button, but by deleting the history.txt file. They could sync all kinds of files without the need for special syncing protocols. They could treat all file types equally, instead of having them arbitrarily divided into "pictures, photos, images, songs, audio" etc. Everything, like in Unix philosophy, should be a file, but not only for developers. Developers should think what parts of their software they need to expose as files to their users.

Comment by **Davidm** on 2013-12-16: I disagree, I think this presents a simplistic approach to the user. I agree that the data should be easy to access, but making it into a .txt file does not nothing to add to that. Instead, if companies truly care about openness, they should make a simple interface, so the user can choose what to delete, without looking at some monstrosity of a text file autogenerated from a SQL database.

Comment by **Brendan Howell** on 2013-12-18: I agree in principle but I would expand this to include any documented standard (or well-accepted and free non-standard (like sqlite or whatever) document/DB format. And +1 to an export function. Data locked in dead applications is sad.

Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-04: @davidm: Putting stuff into text files exactly frees the users from the tyranny of one single interface and dramatically eases migration and the flexibility of software. While this might not be very apparent with SQL dumps indeed, it is great for address books, software settings, chat logs, playlists, email messages, etc.

Comment by **aBe** on 2015-07-03: I see the good side of this, but what about privacy? Wouldn't it be better that files are encrypted in case someone accesses your computer while you're away?

Comment by **Despens** on 2015-07-03: @aBe: Encryption needs to be handled separate from files. There is for example full disk encryption or per-directory encryption.

## **install applications outside of “App Stores”**

suggested by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23

agree 7 disagree 0

On many OSs it becomes more and more difficult to install software outside AppStore/iTunes/Play – such practices cripple software ecosphere, create even more of proprietary partitioned user-communities (“walled-gardens”) and completely centralize software distribution. On GNU/Linux, however, “package repository” (which is a distribution-centric collection of software packages and like that similar to AppStore) is a historic practice dating well back into the 90ies. Though being very popular amongst Linux users, DEB, RPM, OPKG and etc distribution models never restricted users from compiling/installing side-loaded software; on the contrary users are often encouraged to create their own packages and contribute them to package repositories.

## **be the (prime) beneficiary of whatever is created from our “cognitive surplus”**

suggested by **Flo Parallel** on 2013-11-13

agree 7 disagree 0

This is an extension to the ‘Right to get Revenue’ as it was suggested above. The core point here is, that if something is the fruit of aggregated user-labour, it should be of use for those very users and ideally for everybody else – something that is not always the case in crowd-sourcing. Work done by ‘the many’ for free should not be used by or be useful just for ‘the few’. If a product that is being ‘harvested from the hive’ is not useful for those in ‘the hive’ or ‘the crowd’ or the community of users, it is all the more important that the direct or indirect labor by the users is compensated with a fair share of revenue; given that revenue is being made. Where there is no revenue, usefulness becomes all the more important! This of course leads to another point: It should be transparent to us users who is making profit with our contributions and to what extent. By the way, this issue has been discussed at length and very much in

favour of the user in Jaron Lanier's latest book 'Who Owns the Future', and he in turn point back to Ted Nelson's seminal vapour-ware Project Xanadu.

### **remove or reassemble all parts of hardware**

suggested by **klena** on 2013-10-12

agree 8 disagree 1

A Computer is a machine only, but often a personal one which I use very often and in very different ways. I want this thing as flexible and effective as possible, so I should be able to remove and assemble all parts of its hardware by my own.

### **knowledge of how the data is stored**

suggested by **hugo** on 2014-03-01

agree 6 disagree 0

When the data is uploaded to a specific service provider, users should be able to know where that specific service provider stores the data, how long, in which jurisdiction the specific service provider operates, and which laws apply. A solution would be, that all users are free to choose to store their own data on devices (e.g. servers) in their vicinity and under their direct control. This way, users do not have to rely on centralized services. The use of peer-to-peer systems and unhosted apps are a means to that end.

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2014-03-03: see also the right to access the file system and organize my data

### **not be interrupted by a program**

suggested by **hellekin** on 2013-12-05

agree 7 disagree 1

When a user is active on the computer (producing input e.g., via the keyboard), the system SHOULD NOT interrupt that activity unless absolutely required by the system to protect the user's privacy, her integrity, the integrity of her current action, or the integrity of the system.

Otherwise, the system MUST wait for the user to become idle, or to switch back to the attention-hungry application before popping up a window or otherwise stealing focus from the user.

## **have the possibility to make everything usable without internet connection**

suggested by **yay** on 2013-12-03

agree 6 disagree 0

## **a web browser**

suggested by **Flick Harrison** on 2013-10-11

agree 6 disagree 0

Moving from the open space of the web to the walled garden of the app store is a step backwards. The naive user will feel (falsely) comforted by the gatekeeper's security, but certain functionality and interweaving of cultural content will disappear. For instance, the Facebook app is not in the same universe as the Facebook website. Zooming is eliminated. As is, inexplicably, landscape mode. Browser functions like right-clicking for a contextual menu are eliminated, replaced with minimal "copy / define" options. <http://xkcd.com/1174/> Links opened in the app take us elsewhere in the facebook app, framing them as subservices, and possibly introducing another gatekeeper. Worst of all: No adblock in the Appiverse.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: look at Spotify client – essentially it is a mod of Chromium browser while being reworked into a completely locked-down and jailed piece of software.

## **peer-to-peer networks**

suggested by **[no name]** on 2014-05-23

agree 5 disagree 0

## **have more privacy in social networks**

suggested by **Saftiges Gnu** on 2014-04-29

agree 5 disagree 0

In social networks there is a little space for the privacy. Of course you can change your preferences so only friends could see your photos or posts but there are some gaps. For example, WhatsApp has a good solution when it comes to being able to delete my own time stamp at least. It's a matter of fact that on Facebook, I cannot decide whether I want my chat partner to know WHEN I read his messages or not. By seeing my time stamp (opening his message – whether I read it or not) he can conclude that I was online.

### **not have my system “made obsolete”**

suggested by **davidm** on 2013-12-16

agree 6 disagree 1

Too often, Apple will simply stop updating their old operating systems and charge you for the upgrade. You often can't even download new versions of XCode (which you need to program on a OS X computer) unless you pay them for the upgrade. If a company choose to put an operating system out there and sell it for money, it should be either supported by the company or released to be freely supported by the community

### **switch off wireless and use a cable instead**

suggested by **gordo** on 2013-10-13

agree 5 disagree 0

Wireless LAN, wireless USB, bluetooth, wireless HDMI, wireless PS2, wireless air-pop-drop, all good but there should be switch for turning all those things off and take an old-style cable

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-11-01: looks more like an appeal to protect packets' right to run through cables :)

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: i would convert this to “the right not to emit”, see <http://hackaday.com/2013/12/20/ambient-computer-noise-leaks-your-encryption-keys/>

### **hiding my gender**

suggested by **Msriiss** on 2014-11-07

agree 4 disagree 0

## **edit app permissions in android settings.**

suggested by **Bernard** on 2014-04-29

agree 4 disagree 0

In a century of Smartphones and Tablets, we need an app for everything. We update them, give them rights to access our information and many other things. But how does it look like if we don't want to give them any specific rights anymore, without the need to completely delete the app. Why is it not possible to have the right, as the user, to independently change the rights for the app without the need to remove it. Why is it so hard to make an app, that would work with the information WE want to give them. <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2013/12/google-removes-vital-privacy-features-android-shortly-after-adding-them>

## **use my music as a ringtone**

suggested by **tina** on 2014-04-28

agree 5 disagree 1

According to the iTunes terms of use, you are not allowed to use your music as a ringtone on your mobile phone. Anyway, you could use your mp3 as a ringtone for Android phones. iPhones only permit ringtones (m4r), so you need to convert your mp3 in m4r. (only 40 seconds long -.-)

## **install an operating system of my choice on a computer/phone/tablet/device**

suggested by **lo** on 2014-04-02

agree 4 disagree 0

## **deep link**

suggested by **hugo** on 2014-03-02

agree 4 disagree 0

Web publishers should make it easy to deep link to specific parts by using ids. <https://github.com/NYTimes/Emphasis> should be everywhere (including in PDF!)

More: <http://scripting.com/2014/02/23/designChallengeParagraphlevel> Permalinks.html

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2014-03-03: Made me think that the linking itself has to be protected. The Right to Hyperlink!

### **control over user data access**

suggested by **hugo** on 2014-03-01

agree 4 disagree 0

Data explicitly and willingly uploaded by a user should always be under the ultimate control of the user. Users should be able to decide whom to grant (direct) access to their data and under which permissions such access should occur. Cryptography (e.g. a PKI) is necessary to enable this control. Data received, generated, collected and/or constructed from users' online activity while using the service (e.g. metadata or social graph data) should be made accessible to these users and put under their control. If this control can't be given, then this type of data should be anonymous and not stored for long periods.

### **be certain in what country the server I'm connecting to is**

suggested by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23

agree 4 disagree 0

It starts to make more and more sense to know (for sure) in what country (geopolitically) a particular server/service is located. Like with google.de or de-de.facebook.com the user might be tricked into believing they are connecting to a national service while in fact both are hosted in the US. <http://www.geoipview.com/?q=google.de>

### **make screen shots**

suggested by **Aram Bartholl** on 2013-12-22

agree 4 disagree 0

I love them. They will try to get rid of them...

### **have a button labelled "take off from cloud"**

suggested by **gordo** on 2013-10-13

agree 5 disagree 1



One simple click and your data gets downloaded to your “real” localhost and being deleted from the cloud-service. deleted meaning, seriously deleted!

Comment by **Despens** on 2013-10-31: The problem here is that usually users spend years feeding a service with their data – the decision to retreat from a service is usually made much quicker. So that “button” would hardly work like a button, it would rather trigger a week-long download. So I think, the demand for an export function is more meaningful. (See the right to have an “export” function.)

Comment by **hellekin** on 2013-12-05: I think the export functionality is different from deletion. Deletion is an almost-impossible technical issue to solve, especially given the current technology. Therefore, it makes a lot of political sense to demand it. Others labeled it “the right to disappear” in other settings. Let’s consider the technical and legal issues involved: 1. backups. In order to provide a reliable service, data is saved multiple times on various devices, including various supports, and in various places. Deleting all of them requires to keep track of all of them, which in turn can be used to monitor, steal, or make further copies of the data to be deleted. Deleting data has a cost, including the time required to find the contents to delete, load the various supports, and actually delete them. 2. data retention. In order to avoid fraud, prevent crime, monitor terrorist, deviants, citizens, computer users, nations vote laws to force ISPs to keep data, and government agencies illegal abuse those laws to keep data indefinitely in a dragnet surveillance; individual users also keep private copies of stuff you don’t want to share with them, but they have obtained because it was shared once. How to handle that?

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-23: I think “taking off the cloud” means letting user download the data locally and remove it from the remove service/server. How (and if) user decides to re-upload the data elsewhere is up to the user.

## **view the entire history of my online interaction**

suggested by **Jack Fisher** on 2013-10-12

agree 5 disagree 1

The entire history of me/you/us.

Comment by **Paige** on 2013-12-13: why would you want this?

Comment by **dauidm** on 2013-12-16: what does this even mean? this seem contrary to the entire goals of everyone else.

## **not to be interrupted by update suggestions**

suggested by Charlotte on 2019-04-05

agree 3 disagree 0

## **chronological order**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2017-07-03

agree 3 disagree 0

...of posts, entries, files. Social networks gradually switch from Timeline to what they crafty call Algorithmic Timeline\*, meaning it is not chronological, but... nobody knows what and can become something else any moment anyway. Chronological order is a universal convention that would give users control, protect from info bubbles; facilitate dialogs (make commenting possible and meaningful), make "export" function feasible.

<http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/gadgets-and-tech/instagram-algorithmic-timeline-we-are-angry-but-too-lazy-to-take-control-a6949026.html>

[http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/cover\\_story/2017/03/twitter\\_s\\_timeline\\_algorithm\\_and\\_its\\_effect\\_on\\_us\\_explained.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/cover_story/2017/03/twitter_s_timeline_algorithm_and_its_effect_on_us_explained.html)

## **be able to turn off the time stamp in Facebook**

suggested by **Saftiges Gnu** on 2014-04-29

agree 3 disagree 0

The fact that each and every message on "Facebook" is connected with the specific day and time of sending or receiving is necessary on one hand to know exactly when somebody contacted me, but on the other hand also can put pressure on the recipient to answer immediately. Many people are very focused on the times their chat-partners open their messages and get easily disappointed not receiving a reply instantly. "Why does it take so long for him or her to get back to me ?" is what many people ask themselves. WhatsApp for example has a good solution when it comes to being able to delete my own time stamp at least. It's a matter of fact that on Facebook, I cannot decide whether I want my chat partner to know WHEN I read his

messages or not. By seeing my time stamp (opening his message – whether I read it or not) he can conclude that I was online. I would appreciate the option of being able to connect or disconnect the exact point of time of opening my personal messages on Facebook.

### **choose a platform**

suggested by **hugo** on 2014-03-01

agree 3 disagree 0

Users should always be able to extract their data from the service at any time without experiencing any vendor lock-in. Open standards for formats and protocols, as well as access to the programs source code under a Free Software license are necessary to guarantee this.

### **my data not being converted**

suggested by **[no name]** on 2013-12-23

agree 4 disagree 1

The user data uploaded to cloud/proprietary web services are often “converted” – GIF converted to JPEG, OGG to AAC, AVI to MP4, etc. While some of these conversions might have rational grounds many are aimed at “sterilization” of user content – removal of unwanted meta-data, filenames and disable users from steganographic practices.

### **pull**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-12-02

agree 3 disagree 0

This demand was inspired by J. Oliver’s tweet :) “We don’t ‘visit web pages’. They visit us. Unless of course one actually drives all the way to the data center to say hi.” <https://twitter.com/julianoliver/status/404674363548381184>

I have to think about better formulation and proper words to justify... but (leaving all the car driving metaphors aside) it’s important that YOU visit pages, apps, updates, and not the other way around... See also the right not to update.

## get revenue

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-21

agree 4 disagree 1

Some days ago I was reminded by Burak Arikan about the project he and Engin Erdogan started in 2008 -- User Labor Markup Language (ULML). Their idea was to create a transparent situation on code level where "user generated content": "Our aim is to construct criteria and context for determining the value of user labor, which is currently a monetized asset for the service provider but not for the user herself. We believe that universal, transparent, and self-controlled user labor metrics will ultimately lead to more sustainable social web." <http://userlabor.org/>. Another important quote: "While service providers may understand, calculate, and leverage user contribution to determine business plans and solicit advertisers, its value often remains opaque to the users. Activity logs are stored as the property of respective service providers and some providers allow access to parts of these records through their Application Programming Interfaces (API). Still, there is no means for interpreting this information universally across different services."

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-11-17: see also: The right to be the (prime) beneficiary of whatever is created from our "cognitive surplus" suggested by Flo Parallel.

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-11-26: is getting revenue refers to getting even with the systems (like FB) which use user-contributed data?

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-02: my question, probably, is: what 'revenue' is talked about? who would pay the user, for what and how? (not that i disagree, i just would like to extend the general question.)

Comment by **Danja Vasiliev** on 2013-12-02: ok, after reading the comments (and links) above i think i have my answers ;) there is also an interesting publication concerning these issues called "Digital Labor: The Internet as Playground and Factory" by Trebor Scholz.

## **view offline**

suggested by **irgbit** on 2013-10-14

agree 3 disagree 0

## **disagree**

suggested by **user** on 2013-10-12

agree 6 disagree 3

Comment by **Dan T.** on 2013-10-13: Clearly somebody disagrees with disagreeing. How disagreeable!

Comment by **Guergana Tzatchkova** on 2014-06-20: just to disagree!

## **contest the algorithm**

suggested by **arctother** on 2013-10-11

agree 3 disagree 0

## **negotiate terms & conditions**

suggested by **alex.rosado** on 2015-07-03

agree 2 disagree 0

As a user I want to disagree with terms and conditions and get the chance to negotiate when I install software or access to web services.

## **bequeath my social network account**

suggested by **Maxi** on 2015-06-16

agree 2 disagree 0

I think it's important to be able to decide what happens after your death to your social media accounts: Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, Instagram. For example, it should be possible to choose somebody to manage your account after you pass away and the service provider should respect your decision.

## **add manually**

suggested by **Simon Baer** on 2015-05-30

agree 2 disagree 0

Concerning the computer, everything becomes more and more automated these days: various wearables track and save our daily activities automatically, streaming services create new playlists on their own, photos are getting uploaded into the cloud right after taking them, smartphones create contacts for every person we're interacting with. The software on our computers and the apps on our smartphones manage themselves, creating data / data-points automatically, even without letting the user know. As easy, stressless and comfortable this might be – it must still be possible to access this data, modify it and (most important!) add data or data-points – that would otherwise be generated – manually.

## **rename browser tabs**

suggested by **hcc** on 2014-04-29

agree 2 disagree 0

Use browser tabs as often as possible to avoid losing track of your overview while you are surfing on the internet. If any of the sites are important you can bookmark them afterwards you can delete the useless bookmarks from the reading list. Missing: Rename the browser tabs the way you want.

## **have every OS and mobile device compatible with each other**

suggested by **elviapw** on 2013-10-28

agree 3 disagree 1

## **link**

suggested by **olia lialina** on 2020-06-03

agree 1 disagree 0

Would never thought I'd write it. And as the list shows it didn't appear important or urgent to anyone in 2013, when most of demands were made. When in 2014 user "hugo" introduced the right to deep linking, I left the comment which looked as a joke because indeed it was not

meant serious enough. But today's tweet of [bbbeecca](#) as well as other sad observations: <https://twitter.com/GIFmodel/status/1264189665806110726?s=20> "My student put documentation of his links based performance on Vimeo, but couldn't link to the actual project, because Vimeo turns URLs into links only for customers who upgraded to Plus."

<https://twitter.com/GIFmodel/status/1255564459243909120?s=20> "all jokes aside, the very existence of this service shouts about absurdity of today's web, hypocrisy of social networks and misery of their users."

suggested that it is time to remind to social networks that hyperlinks are not just some features or style element, but as Hossein Derakhshan wonderfully said in 2015 "They are its [web's] eyes, a path to its soul." <https://medium.com/matter/the-web-we-have-to-save-2eb1fe15a426>

Comment by [olia lialina](#) on 2020-06-06: "Free speech in hypertext implies the 'right to link', which is the very basic building unit for the whole Web" writes Tim Berners-Lee in 2000 in *Weaving the Web*. He adds "if the general write to link is not upheld for any reason, then fundamental principles of free speech are at stake, and something had better be changed." pp. 139, 141

## show filetypes

suggested by [topada](#) on 2015-12-20

agree 1 disagree 0

In this easy-breasy world its necessary to know your files and how to modify them!

## not synchronize

suggested by [Rachel Uwa](#) on 2015-07-05

agree 1 disagree 0

If I look up something on my laptop, I do not wish to see auto-complete when I look the same thing up on my mobile phone. In (my) perfect world, these two devices should not speak!

## not be a user

suggested by [aBe](#) on 2015-07-03

agree 1 disagree 0

Many online services require you to create an account, and your e-mail to be validated, before they can be used. I demand the right to use without creating accounts and becoming a registered user. Privacy is one reason. I want to be able to participate in an anonymous way. A second reason is that I believe it stops users from giving valuable feedback in forums, because they refuse to become users. There are services like <http://bugmenot.com/> to share log in information, which helps to avoid creating an account. It is said that sites like Facebook create profiles of people who don't have an account. That means you become a user without being asked for it.

### **limit my content's virality**

suggested by **JulieS** on 2015-07-03

agree 1 disagree 0

Or: creating a sense of neighborhood knowledge through digital rights policy. This is essentially a demand to have an easier way to manage group privacy, and potentially to start a framework for multiple people's interacting rights to unilateral deletion of what eventually becomes shared content. Right now privacy policy is largely opt-out, with the onus on the user to create blacklists. This intends to create a starting point that is opt-in, with a usable and understandable whitelist, and then ask permission whenever content virality exceeds those limitations. Some potential questions this hopes to address: 1. When does my UGC stop being my own and becomes part of a social domain, therefore limiting my own power over it? 2. Something I said/created was intended for a specific audience, and I don't want it to go any further. So I want to preemptively limit the spread of my content, either to n-degree of separation from my initial posting, or a geographic location.

### **login**

suggested by **florian kuhlmann** on 2015-01-24

agree 1 disagree 0

Since the immersion is continuing every day and computer systems are becoming an essential part of our society and our life, everybody must have the right to login everywhere, every time, whenever he or she wants it or needs it. Access must be granted to everyone, just as logout must be possible every time.



## **exclude myself from experiments**

suggested by **Brett O'Connor** on 2014-06-30

agree 1 disagree 0

Design experiments, a/b testing, etc. on social media and other websites may adversely affect the emotional health and function of its users under the guise of improving the website. Users should have the option to exclude themselves from such experiments.

## **have Ted Nelsons transclusion instead of copy&paste**

suggested by **Milan** on 2014-06-16

agree 1 disagree 0

"Transclusion is a simple scheme which allows us to cite, paraphrase any bit of content from anywhere on the web without actually copying it. Transclusion is such a concept which has long promised to revolutionize the way people share content on the world wide web. The quoted text will link back to its original source and the link address never changes. The web in a way is broken by severe content duplication. No wonder that Google has been tweaking its search algorithms so often – the series of changes starting with Hummingbird have been aimed at cleaning the 'cut-and-paste' mess. The idea of Transclusion can end this mess. Content need not be duplicated. As long as the originator of the content can assure that it never moves from its place (the link), people can link to the document while relevant portions showing up on their own pages." – by Prashanth Hebbar

## **see acceptable ads**

suggested by **hulio** on 2014-04-29

agree 2 disagree 1

I don't want these annoying, flashing and loud advertisements on websites. They are evil.

## **customize colour schemes**

suggested by **conny** on 2014-04-29

agree 1 disagree 0

A friend of mine is colour blind and is often not able to use certain apps, programs or websites. He needs a way to personalize/customize the color schemes. In some web browsers this is possible but most apps for example don't have this feature.

### **eat kernels**

suggested by **useless2112** on 2014-01-24

agree 1 disagree 0

### **not be spied upon by my device**

suggested by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23

agree 1 disagree 0

Our device/software should not secretly retain or transmit data eg: iPhone GPS caches, Xbox One swearing detection, Facebook 'self-censorship' technique (when text input is send on every keystroke) and so on. User shall be aware of every instance of data leaving their computer/program, and as such – integration of locally installed software and its online counterpart shall never be seamless.

### **hardware inter-compatibility**

suggested by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23

agree 1 disagree 0

We'd like to be able to freely swap parts between different parts of our hardware and use different devices in combination of one and another. For example – use smartphone as a webcam with PC, use PC's internal HDD as storage for our mobile, use same battery across different types/makes of devices, use same cables.

### **DDOS!**

suggested by **NewMedians** on 2013-12-23

agree 2 disagree 1

And consider online acts of protest equal to protests of streets!

Legalize DDoS attacks!

DDoS = Strike

## reply-all

suggested by **Anthony Antonellis** on 2013-11-19

agree 2 disagree 1

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-11-19: [https://twitter.com/a\\_antonellis/status/400982264064253952](https://twitter.com/a_antonellis/status/400982264064253952) I wouldn't want to live in a world without reply-all

## not use

suggested by **Kein Kunstler** on 2020-05-07

agree 0 disagree 0

## read the truth

suggested by **[no name]** on 2019-11-28

agree 0 disagree 0

## disappear

suggested by **Niko Princen** on 2017-11-15

agree 0 disagree 0

## be real

suggested by **Siri** on 2016-10-09

agree 0 disagree 0

## Control+Alt+Delete

suggested by **#fbuser** on 2015-01-25

agree 0 disagree 0

Comment by **Dominik Podsiadly** on 2015-02-17: <http://www.theverge.com/2013/9/26/4772680/bill-gates-admits-ctrl-alt-del-was-a-mistake>

## set my own level of error correction!

suggested by **FFD8** on 2014-11-05

agree 0 disagree 0

Too many tools are 'helping' by fixing errors, patching transmission packet loss, bad buffers, corrupt data. Let us decide just how perfect+safe <-> volatile our movie plays, our image displays, our text renders. Amazing creative surprises are being hidden from us with every update!

## ruin Internet Explorer. Forever.

suggested by **Maggy** on 2014-04-28

agree 2 disagree 2

It would be really nice if IE would no longer exist, because it is the worst browser out there!

Reasons:

- it's slowly
- crashes all the time
- many unnecessary Add-ons
- just 9.7% of people use it in March 2014. (statistics collected from W3School) – My biggest problem: IE is hard to make webpages compatible with it! > does not support latest web standards (as a programmer i really hate this). So ... we don't need it!

## abuse

suggested by **Niko Princen** on 2014-01-15

agree 2 disagree 2

Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-19: Abusing a computer or a network is a very difficult concept, since both work best if they are imagined without a purpose. If to accept "abuse", it automatically means that there is a "purposeful" usage of a computer, hence giving in to the current state of controlled environments.

Comment by **Niko Princen** on 2017-11-15: There's as much purpose to computers as to life. To abuse the networked machine is a way a user can try to set itself free from the "controlled environment" the computer or network was built in without necessarily following the opposite

direction of its creation. Every user is controlled by what it uses. Rules of usage don't need a purpose. Abnormal use is outside the system. It's unseen, without balance, alone, impossible.

### **convert any data for any device**

suggested by **poinck** on 2013-12-28

agree 1 disagree 1

I want to read webpages correctly formatted on an eBook reader in an open format like EPUB. I demand, that either calibre can convert every article on a webpage or webpages are designed to be easily parsed by it to be converted into EPUB. For now, it is very difficult to read the article "Turing complete User" on a eReader.

Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-04: This is a very weird demand, at least when illustrated by this example. Web pages are usually HTML and can be converted quite easily. I don't think that there should be a right to already being served with all data in all kinds of possible specialized formats, because this is a very passive attitude. It is important get data in standardized formats.

### **plug off**

suggested by **klena** on 2013-10-12

agree 1 disagree 1

Shut down, turn off and at least: plug off. People shouldn't trust in machines only and always be able to live their life without them. but we've already reached the point where we're unable to rule our world without computer power. No way, to plug it off...

### **idempotent requests without legal repercussions**

suggested by **erlehmenn** on 2013-10-07

agree 1 disagree 1

free weev!

Comment by **despens** on 2014-01-04: What is this??

## **actively distinguish between contributing to the public record and engaging in heresay**

suggested by **Kino** on 2013-10-23

agree 0 disagree 2

There should be certain markers that a creator of content can use to give legitimate truth value or a measure of authenticity to an online publication. By adding to the public record in this way the contributor opens themselves up to scrutiny and allows for an archiving into the public record. Such non-propaganda contribution to the public good should be rewarded higher in any sort of compensatory system explored above. Conversely a user of the net should have the freedom to banter, flirt, be at times hot headed and speak opinion and belief and not have such idle banter used as a way to incriminate themselves by such utterance. Instead of higher compensation and archiving, such contributions should be flagged with a level of privacy and respect and if used for analysis that analysis must use the highest ethical standards for how human subjects are used in sociological studies in a scientific setting. Such protections should include anonymity, a measure of time before such data can be accessed for such study, etc. Such utterance should also be protected from search and seizure. People exchanging idle banter should not be incriminating themselves by association or by utterance and should not bring suspicion on their communication partners. Two other kinds of utterances could be contributed towards some fair use/open source/artistic remix canon and conversely it should be possible to establish deep private connections to loved ones, family, etc.

Comment by **olia lialina** on 2013-10-23: hmm, a believe that privacy can be achieved by "semantic web"... have to think.