Commissioners:

I have been involved in internet innovation almost from the beginning of the public internet. I was Chief Architect, Chief Technical Office, or founder of new startups, most of which have moved into becoming profitable divisions of larger companies. Examples of these are:

* A sports information and imaging service (now part of Microsoft)
* A multimedia development firm in the fine art marketplace (now part of Getty Images)
* An aerospace information service (now part of Boeing)
* A internet-based engineering parts catalog (now part of Boeing)
* An internet-based Quality Assurance Documentation system for Cal Tech’s Jet Propulsion Laboratories, still in use at various locations in NASA, and grew it into a stand-alone documentation service for health care and other highly regulated industry sectors

In addition, I’ve implemented significant online educational programs and provide educational content and services to a number of different educational institutions, both in the United States and internationally.

None of this would have happened without a *de facto* and then a *de jure* net neutrality. I’m currently working on a new educational application, and I have put it on hold, as I am unwilling to take the risk of having my content throttled by an untrammeled Verizon or Comcast. These two companies, in particular, have consistently demonstrated their unworthiness as business partners, even under regulation. Without an enforced neutrality, where ISPs must function as common carriers, small, innovative enterprises like mine cannot survive.

I am *not* arguing for a “free internet.” I have no objection to paying for my content to get onto the internet—it must be paid for by someone! What I am arguing against is allowing ISPs to establish walls of exclusion for innovation, simply because large companies (currently the Amazons, Googles, and Netflixes, who were once just small companies like me) can pay for protection. We don’t allow this in the physical marketplace (there we call the denial of neutrality what it is—collusion in restraint of trade); we shouldn’t allow it in the virtual marketplace.

Thank you for your consideration
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