

- Concluding Notes Re: Choice -



As we perceive a ubiquitous digitization of our environments, the Internet is quickly becoming the Defacto conduit for information including email, news, video, applications, and documents. If communication is the means of relaying or exchanging information, then today, the Internet is communication. The implicit potency of domain names to elicit behavior patterns in users, on behalf of their owners, is portrayed as value by the premium commanded by domains that relate common vocabulary to category ownership.

Ambiguity mandated by the suffixing of traditional top-level labels, such as .com and .org, serves as a buffer to the effects of term ownership on the psychology of perception and on the permeance of the root. The power of association imparted to example.com relative to another.example.com today pales in comparison to that of "example" relative to example.com tomorrow. Any claim that root zone management or maintenance is not susceptible to eventual misdirection by compounded interests due to a generalization of root labels is offset by the progressive introduction of consequential gTLDs to the global root, as they diminish local spheres of influence.

As revenues from the new gTLD program work to incentivize normative relativism in propulsion of industry, entities will naturally reinvest in establishing their brands as authorities for the labels they control. Inevitably, the disappearance of the dot prefixing domain names becomes just as plausible as the fate of the dot suffixing domain names, through any number of applicable venues. Thus, the current trajectory towards Internet governance is predictive of a private organization adjudicating direct, exclusive reference to common words between entities vying to monopolize a category in communication.

At the heart of the US Government's conditions for transition is an underlying desire to avert the misdirection of economic determinability as such may benefit a few at the expense of many, including itself. The only viable way to ensure that an organization remains impervious to an amalgamation of interests is to render that organization economically indecisive, insomuch as outcomes are predicated by the actions of another independent organization respectively driven by competing interests. Willfully imposing neutrality by carefully honing organizations in concert effectively negates offensive takeover, contrary to tactics requiring overt latitude.

Internet governance is not a construct that can be physically transferred. It is the earned will of e pluribus unum, as signaled by widespread accord throughout a diverse set of communities in response to the prudent establishment of institutions that are structured to reflect the granular interests of their constituencies and empowered to operate the levers of control over one another in the direction of public service.

Tamer Rizk
August 21, 2014