

What does it mean to be free? It seems that question is not asked anymore. Liberty is a bygone notion and what is best for the people has become a joke and something to placate to when trying to get what you actually want. Who can argue that the internet is the one thing that has touched and impacted nearly everyone on this planet? While it has its bad sides you cannot ignore the good it has provided. One might say it is a true representation of humanity. The decisions you make will impact many other countries and in turn humanity. I know that it's a little out there but take a moment to think about the impact this decision will make when you add 10, 20, 50 years to it and how it will shape our lives. Please look at the history of the internet, how it was able to grow, the financial model that was behind it and how the quest for maintaining Moore's Law was made profitable. No government was jammed in the middle during any of that, it was democratic (not a reference to the US political party) at best and it grew organically. If you change that model you change how and if it will grow and be used.

I have been on the "internet" long before it was called "the internet". Back when there were a few universities that linked their huge mainframes together. Then it grew. No DNS existed back then so you needed to know the IP of where you were going and there was a handy text file that listed IPs and the name of the company or location it was connected to... I think I may still have a copy of a few versions yea.. that little text file became a company called Yahoo! I spent time on "The WELL" and was there when the first commercial traffic was allowed. I also built private networks, bulletin board systems (BBS) with a bank of modems people could dial into and share info, socialize.. really the precursor to Facebook. My point? It was all free. TOTALLY FREE. All you needed was an analog phone line, a modem and a computer. The communication was your RIGHT as a US citizen. No service provider (The WELL became one of the first), no access fees etc. The SPEED in which we transferred data 40 years ago was silly compared to today's standards as they will be in 40 years from now. To have a preferred or reserved bandwidth or speed for ANY entity based on a fee breaks the very basis of what the internet was intended to represent. The only real reason such a consideration is on the table is because the existing bandwidth is not adequate for the task. Just like a 2400 baud modem couldn't handle today's cell phone internet usage. If, today, you had 10GbE to each internet device (phone, tablet, computer, flat screen displays (we can't call them TVs anymore can we?)) then having Netflix stream 10 movies to each device is a joke. In the not so distant future a 1PbE (1 Peta bit Ethernet) link will make the decisions make now seem idiotic. The point is that the scale is the issue. Technology will catch up, it always has. However if you lay groundwork for a financial model where it is more profitable for the providers NOT to upgrade to the new technology and charge more for the little bandwidth it does have then you have just ended the natural advancement of the technology. You remove the underlying driver, there isn't a profit model and in fact you create a negative push, which is the exact opposite effect I assume you are looking for.

This question should not be about the corporate desires of the current cast of players. Instead it should be based on the right thing to do when looking larger patterns in the history of the internet and what drivers make it successful and free. Drowning you in legal paperwork and giving positive names to bills and actions that are far from positive for the population and far more positive for the ones that wrote and lobbied it; are the tools of the corporate monopolies. Honestly; actually look up the definition of the word "monopoly" and tell me that is not what we are dealing with?

If you are idiotic enough to actually move forward with slicing up the internet (yes you are slicing, I know you doubt that now but you are) based on bandwidth and speed then at least provide a reasonable

ratio. The world gets 90% and the "special interests" can pay for the top 10% on an EVEN SCALE. This may even help. IF you allow a ratio that is weighted towards "special interests" than public then you are looking at a reversal of growth and a breakdown of the fundamental nature of the internet.

Government is often ridiculed for being short sided and a collection of bought out "representatives." This is based on actions taken and the disconnect between the citizens and the government. It is the selfless acts of the founders of this country that made it what it is today. Many feel that should read: what it "could be again." It seems that the best years of this country are behind us due to corporate and external influences applied to good people in government, decisions get made one at a time that does not take into account the selfless answers that our forefathers came to and that will hold up to history... What would Thomas Jefferson do?

Please take into consideration that you protect the citizen and are one of the last lines of defense they have when it comes to communications. I beg you to open an honest dialog with people that CANNOT benefit from the decision no matter the direction it takes and learn from a formula that made the internet have a wildly successful history up to this point.

I am available to discuss offline.....

-Ken Leach