As Internet is reaching more and more population by connecting everyone throughout the world. It would be very inappropriate if we start charging people based on the applications that they choose to use. I am completely against the motion of FCC to repeal Net Neutraility. The major reason why internet is the most loved media as compared to television, radio or telephone is becasuse it has no regulations on it. That is the major reason why giants like Facebook, Twitter and Instagram developed and people began to connect with each other easily and freely.If people start getting charged for using different kinds of application there will be a socio cohesion because of it and a class system would be created like the past. Whereby only the rich and the people who can afford it would gain access to it and rest would just stop using the application and would switch to other free source.

Network and **revolution**: It is because of unregulated existence of social media that many revolutionary moment come into existence. People use Facebook to schedule the protest, Twitter to coordinate, trend those moments and YouTube to tell the world their end results.

# An example of this to portray it was given by Maeve Shearlaw, 2016, Egypt five years on: was it ever a 'social media revolution'? ”On 25 January 2011 hundreds of thousands of protesters started to gather in Tahrir Square and planted the seeds of unrest which, days later, finally unseated the incumbent president, Hosni Mubarak, after 30 years of power.

# Almost a year after [Tunisia had erupted](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jan/14/tunisian-president-flees-country-protests)in mass demonstrations, the central Cairo protests triggered further waves of change across the [Middle East and North Africa](https://www.theguardian.com/world/interactive/2011/mar/22/middle-east-protest-interactive-timeline), in what became known as the Arab Spring. But while the nature of each pro-democracy uprising, and their ultimate success, varied wildly from country to country, they had one defining characteristic in common: [social media](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/25/twitter-facebook-uprisings-arab-libya).”

Network neutrality should **not be about “who pays” for Internet service or infrastructure**: Consider an example where a company pays monthly bulk amount to the service provider and Amazon on the other hand just pays based on the numbers of item bought by people using that service provider. Thus the service provider should not reduce the bandwidth of Amazon and make its service slower or inefficient just because it is getting less profit from it. That would be quite unfair for Amazon and users as they pay a fixed amount to the service provider and are getting different bandwidth for different websites.

According to Peha, J.M. 2007 [The Benefits and Risks of Mandating Network Neutrality, and the Quest for a Balanced Policy.](https://blackboard.syr.edu/bbcswebdav/pid-299613-dt-content-rid-991703_1/xid-991703_1)

A policy designed to protect beneficial uses of discrimination might allow the following:

• Network operators could provide different quality of service to different classes of traffic using explicit prioritization or other techniques. These techniques can be used to favor traffic with stricter quality of service requirements, and/or traffic sent using a higher-priced service.

• Network operators could charge a different price for different classes of traffic. The higher price would be justified because the traffic requires superior quality of service, consumes more of a limited resource, has a greater adverse effect on other traffic, or is otherwise linked to cost (or opportunity cost).

• Network operators could block traffic that poses a threat to security, or that a reasonable network engineer might believe poses a threat to security.

• Network operators could charge the senders of information, recipients, or both.

• Network operators could offer proprietary content or unique services to their customers (without using their dominant control over the last-mile connection to favor their content or service).

• Network operators could block traffic originating from an attached device that one might reasonably believe is harmful to the network or its users, such as one that does not follow prescribed protocols and algorithms.

• Network operators could use any form of discrimination they wish, if the broadband market becomes truly competitive.
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