**I vehemently support strong Net Neutrality backed by Title II oversight of ISPs.**

I am not a business owner. I am a college student. My art, my comics, are a labor of love that I do solely because I want to. Repealing Net Neutrality would put no ding in my income. But I am still an artist, and if access to certain Internet sites is prioritized, I fear that my content will be unjustly slowed. My comics glorify cooperation and communication, condemn war and greed and the frequent intersection of the two, show LGBT teenagers and characters of color being happy and secure in their identities, and lambast those who believe that just because the world does belong to them means that it should. Few to none of these things, I believe, are things that large corporations like to see, and on an Internet without Net Neutrality, I sincerely doubt that my status as unknown artist would ever change.

Furthermore, I am still a consumer, and I believe that when I buy Internet access, what I am buying is a *utility*, like electricity. I am not buying a number of services from a provider, I am buying access to services, much the same way that I only buy electricity from BG&E and not light bulbs, microwaves, or digital clocks. I get my Internet access from Verizon, but I use that access to obtain information services from Google, comics hosting from SmackJeeves, entertainment from Failbetter Games, and the maintenance of dear friendships from Discord. I dearly *want* to say that I promote my artwork and maintain other friendships through yet another party, but thanks to the Yahoo! buyout of Tumblr, that comes from Verizon, too - which is not what I am paying for. If a better social media site opens itself up, and my friends went there, I would jump ship in a heartbeat - which Net Neutrality enables me to do. Without Net Neutrality, Verizon could slow my traffic to the better site, which puts a stranglehold on competition.

I do not believe capitalism is the best way to run an economy, but I do understand how it works, and competition is one of its linchpins. If there is no protection for small businesses, for competitors who are not the giant monopolies, then those competitors cannot prove themselves to the best of their abilities and provide the best balance of service and price. With monopolies, you do not have capitalism - you have *mercantilism*, a return to the days when a stockpile of gold and silver determined wealth, and Adam Smith's tombstone is revolving. Foolishly, I still believe in the power of government to provide that necessary regulatory force, and I sincerely wish Theodore Roosevelt would come back with his big stick and defend Net Neutrality with the same vehemence that he destroyed the railroad trusts. Indeed, the Internet is even more deserving of trust-busting than railroads, for the Internet is an even better tool than the railroads are.

Which brings me to my last point: the Internet is a vital part of life, not just for Americans, but for humans. We live in a time of unparalleled access to information and entertainment, across the globe, and America has great influence over that globe. The decision to reverse Net Neutrality would set precedent for other countries to do the same. On an Internet where no portion has Net Neutrality, the entire world would suffer. The Internet is a tool for communication, and those who do not want to protect communication usually know they'd have to face consequences if people talked about them.

Thank you.

Harriett Enriquez