






Contents

| Preface | | | III | |
|---------------|--|--|-----|--|
| Bibl | liogra | aphy | IX | |
| Abbreviations | | | | |
| I. | Int | roduction | 1 | |
| A. | Ob | jectives of the book | 1 | |
| B. | Not | tion and meaning of cyberspace | 2 | |
| C. | | ernet governance as part of cyberspace regulation | 3 | |
| II. | Co | nfrontation of traditional legal concepts with globalization | 5 | |
| A. | De | velopment of international public law concepts | 5 | |
| | 1. | Insights from Roman law | 5 | |
| | | a) Res nullius and res communis | 5 | |
| | | b) Jus naturale and jus gentium | 6 | |
| | 2. | Nation States: sovereignty principle | 7 | |
| | | a) Concept of Westphalian Peace Treaty | 7 | |
| | | b) Challenges of borderless cyberspace | 10 | |
| В. | Present international public law in transition | | 13 | |
| | 1. | Relativization of territoriality principle | 13 | |
| | | a) Scope of territoriality principle | 13 | |
| | | b) Applicable law | 13 | |
| | | c) Jurisdiction | 15 | |
| | 2. | Provocation by the "autonomy of cyberspace" concept | 15 | |
| | 3. | Adequacy of analogies to other legal fields | 19 | |
| C. | Es | cape movement: soft law | 22 | |
| | 1. | Notion and forms of self-regulation | 22 | |
| | 2. | Legal "quality" of self-regulation | 24 | |
| | 3. | Strengths of self-regulation | 27 | |
| | 4. | Weaknesses of self-regulation | 28 | |
| | 5. | Importance of self-regulation in the online world | 29 | |

| III. | Ch | allenges for regulatory approaches in cyberspace | 33 | |
|------|--|---|--|--|
| A. | Un | derstanding of law and regulation | 33 | |
| | 1. | Law as a system | 33 | |
| | 2. | Regulation as a tool of the State | 35 | |
| В. | | aditional rationales and concepts of regulation | 36 | |
| | 1. | Public interest theory | 36 | |
| | 2. | Welfare economics theory | 37 | |
| | 3. 4. | Public choice theory Institutionalism theory | 38 38 | |
| | 4. 5. | Capturel cyclical theory | 38 39 | |
| ~ | | | | |
| C. | | cial change as challenge for regulation | 40 | |
| | 1. | Social/environmental developments and dynamic concepts | 41 | |
| | 2. 3. | Qualitatively improved regulatory strategies | 44 | |
| | 3. | Flexibility of law: relative autonomy a) Theory of open systems | 47 47 | |
| | | b) Autopoiesis approach | 47 | |
| | | c) Relative autonomy and change of law | 49 | |
| А. | | search for new rule-making approaches in cyberspace de-based regulation Concept of Lessig a) Architecture as key element b) Influence of law and policy c) Problems of the code-based approach Lex informatica as alternative | 53 53 54 54 57 58 60 | |
| B. | Regulation through formalized standards and networks | | | |
| | 1. | Socio-legal background | 63 | |
| | 2. | Interlinked networks approach | 65 | |
| | 3. | Complexity structures in networks | 68 | |
| C. | Informal law-making | | | |
| | 1. | Law-making through (informal) social contract | 70 | |
| | 2. | Informality features in law-making | 74 | |
| | 3. | Customary Internet-ional law | 76 | |
| | 4. | Appendix: Importance of accountability | 78 | |
| D. | No | rmativity-oriented regulatory concepts | 80 | |
| | 1. | Philosophical background | 80 | |
| | 2. | Hybrid economy and information society | 82 | |

| | 3. | Democracy, participation, constitutionalism | 85 |
|----|-----|--|-----|
| | | a) Concept of "civic virtue" | 85 |
| | | b) Concept of "semiotic democracy" | 87 |
| | | c) Concept of societal constitutionalism | 88 |
| E. | Ass | sessment of regulatory theories and of possible future perspectives | 89 |
| | 1. | Complexity of structured matrix | 89 |
| | 2. | Polycentric and sectoral regulation | 90 |
| | 3. | Hybrid and mesh regulation | 92 |
| | 4. | Interim conclusion | 95 |
| V. | Dev | velopment of a "Global Cyberspace Framework" (GCF) | 99 |
| A. | | roductory Remarks | 99 |
| B. | | licy parameters for cyberspace rule-making | 102 |
| 2. | 1. | Political visions of rule-making | 102 |
| | 2. | Scope and limits of rule-making approaches | 106 |
| | 3. | Structured rule-making processes (multi-layer governance) | 109 |
| | | a) Principles of a multi-layer approach | 109 |
| | | b) Development of normative multi-layer governance principles | 110 |
| | | c) Macro-legal and micro-legal level approach as alternative | 111 |
| | 4. | Legitimacy of cyberspace rule-making | 112 |
| C. | Gu | iding principles of a Global Cyberspace Framework | 115 |
| | 1. | Formal/procedural principles of a Global Cyberspace Framework | 115 |
| | | a) Need for a dynamic and flexible approach | 115 |
| | | b) Need for a user-centered and community-related approach | 118 |
| | 2. | Identification of the relevant substantive principles of cyberspace | 120 |
| | 3. | Realization of multistakeholder participation | 126 |
| | | a) General foundations | 127 |
| | | b) Important elements of multistakeholder participation | 129 |
| | | c) Multistakeholder participation in Internet governance debates | 131 |
| | 4. | Compliance with basic socio-legal values | 136 |
| | | a) Acknowledgement of cultural diversity | 136 |
| | | b) Recognition of cyberspace openness | 138 |
| | | c) Implementation of corresponding technological values: neutrality and interoperability | 142 |
| | 5. | Implementation of structural governance principles | 145 |
| | | a) Organizational management requirements | 145 |
| | | b) Enforcement and dispute resolution requirements | 148 |
| | | | |

| D. | Inc | orporation of a Global Cyberspace Framework | 149 |
|-----|-----|---|-----|
| | 1. | Need for internationalization of policy structures | 150 |
| | 2. | Need for multi-layer/polycentric approach with multistakeholder | |
| | | participation | 152 |
| | 3. | Need for consensus on guiding principles | 154 |
| | | a) General declaration and additional protocols | 154 |
| | | b) Agreement on guiding principles | 156 |
| | | c) Quality of rule-making | 158 |
| | 4. | Need for improved emphasis on the functions of rules | 159 |
| Ind | ex | | 161 |