Regarding the move away from net neutrality, I really don’t want anyone controlling my level of access to the internet. We probably need to move beyond the laws of the 1930’s and recognize the internet for what it has become, and not rationalize the role of an ISP to fit their own objectives. A major portion of the internet is dedicated to commerce. Any ISP that restricts commerce could be subject to anti-trust laws (right?). It is also a platform for communications; any restriction would violate our right to free speech. It is a platform for communities to thrive; any restriction here violates our right to assemble. If the FCC enacts rules that enable corporate controls over content it is inevitable that someone will feel their rights were violated, and we will have years and years of court cases. And then innovation and the growth of our digital world will be managed by lawyers and judges.

It’s possible that the internet is more analogous to traditional mail service then “real time” phone or cable services. Like mail it should be open equally to everyone with no preference for content, sender, or receiver. If companies want to create their own private services for specific purposes (consider the analogy of fed-ex vs traditional mail) there is nothing stopping them. They can create new connectivity, hosting, and applications to deliver specific content. Corporations create private networks routinely to manage their own internal content. But don’t confuse that with the public, open internet. The role of the ISP is to facilitate the connection to content they do not own or pay for; they should be heavily restricted to the connectivity role only.