

In regards to the proposal entitled, “Restoring Internet Freedom:”

It is absolutely understandable that the FCC wants to keep the internet safe and secure for everyone using it, and that there may in fact be better ways to do it than resorting to Title II. However, removing existing rules against throttling content without having a better replacement plan may open the door to internet service providers asking companies to pay for priority treatment. Not having any regulations in place would leave those trying to police such unethical behavior unable to do so, except in the cases of the worst possible behavior. This would of course lead to ISPs charging for the right to access services that users use already, understanding that when we pay for internet connection, we are paying for the transmission of data and not the applications themselves. I'm concerned that such an occurrence would limit the capacity for places like schools, hospitals, and libraries to pay for internet connection, and those who are unemployed may find it even more difficult to apply for jobs, since most job applications these days must be filed online. This is why I say scrapping net-neutrality is unethical, at least without something substantial to replace it.

Of course, if that is the FCC's intent, then my argument will fall on deaf ears. The internet users of the United States, however, will be rather unhappy if this goes through and, say, Comcast decides that YouTube is no longer an available site on their list of points to which a user can connect without paying.

Here's to hoping freedom of press is more important than money,
- Elizabeth