I've been thinking=a lot about this the past few days, some of my thoughts below:

On the other hand, I wonder=if this is a variant of trumpism, we need to make the internet great again= At what point was it great before? When their were but a select few who w=re able to access it; and everybody on it knew they would be meddled with = bit. Once it went too mainstream no-longer was being a hacker (or even, u=er) of such systems an at-your-own-risk endeavor, but was something that p=ople depended on.

Similar modern endeavors include Urbit, link=d for posterity https://urbit.org, =hich is mostly made incomprehensible for the point of keeping out the un-e=lightened. Urbit is supposed to re-imagine computing as fundamentally dist=ibuted.

I think it would require very close consideration to f=gure out why a new internet is actually needed. Traditionally in CS we thi=k of a distributed system as striving to achieve Consistency, Availability= and Partition Tolerance (see Brewer's theorem, <https:=/www.infoq.com/articles/cap-twelve-years-later-how-the-rules-have-changed>) but unable to get all 3 as they mutually assure each other'= impossibility. If we add in a fourth parameter at a second layer of abstr=ction, let's call it Authenticity, a fifth, Privacy, and a sixth, law =nforcement, we cover the gamut of most of what people care about in an int=rnet system. These second three principles form another triangle similar t= CAP, they mutually assure the other's impossibility in some way.

I think that thinking in terms of these desirable properties in ter=s of mutually exclusive groups is probably a useful way to consider the de=ign space. Another well known one is Zooko's triangle: @JeremyRubin

On Mon, Jul 25, 2016 at 7:08 AM, jeffrey E. =span dir="ltr"><jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

    I liked the idea of internet 2.0 �=A0 encouraged by the reset switch.

    --

    �=A0   please note

including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved