

Re: Great SWT Program

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2007-10/msg01234.html>

- *From:* blmblm@xxxxxxxxxxxxx <blmblm@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 10 Oct 2007 09:48:34 GMT
-

In article <1191986368.876982.236900@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, <nebulous99@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Oct 8, 5:00 am, blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx <blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I'm not objecting to any of the specifics of your "bill of rights"; what I find strange is that you call them "rights". I don't have any objection to your defining a standard of behavior that you think providers of online services should do their best to meet and criticizing those who don't meet it; what I find strange is that you apparently think it's your right to demand that they meet your standard. (I'm not explaining this very well; if the idea doesn't come across anyway -- oh well.)

A voluntary standard would be a good first step, but ultimately I think we really do need some stronger protections of ordinary users and consumers online.

Could be. I'm not sure how that could be accomplished effectively (government regulation?), but -- could be. I'm not denying that there are problems, just wondering whether there's a good solution.

Between attempts at government or big business to constrain and regulate user behavior in order to fatten their own wallets or push some particular notion of morality (just look at the amount of anti-videogame, anti-gambling, and anti-porn activity by governments online!), and spammers and scammers and yes, bullies on usenet trying to pierce peoples' anonymity and expose them to the risk of being stalked or attacked offline ...

"Interac"? Ah, apparently I've been guilty of US-centrism. It hadn't occurred to me that things might work differently in whatever part of the world you live in.

Re: Great SWT Program

That would be North America. European banking works differently?

--

B. L. Massingill

ObDisclaimer: I don't speak for my employers; they return the favor.

.