

## Internet Service = "Common Carrier"

Those that provide internet service should have obligations as a "common carrier". Prioritizing, degrading, or censoring legal data streams to and from paying customers should not be tolerated. There is no good excuse for these practices as providing sufficient bandwidth makes all such arguments irrelevant. Thus codifying into law these provisions will ensure an ISP will have to provide adequate bandwidth for all, not just a favored few.

Broadband internet is vital to a competitive US economy and leaving it largely in the hands of a few corporations to decide how it will work is a foolish disaster. Already the US high speed internet is too slow, too costly, and with low rates of competition and roll out. Our position is slipping down the list of countries as is our ability to compete and innovate.

Network neutrality provisions will certainly be needed when you consider the history of broken promises and unfettered avarice in the teleco industry. What happened to the promised 45mb fiber optic broadband promised in 1996 by the telecoms to be delivered by 2006 in exchange for \$200 billion in tax breaks, fee increases, and other considerations? The fact of the matter is they delivered none of it! They took the money and cross subsidized other areas of their business operations to compete unfairly and through merger consolidation walked away from their obligations. They essentially stole \$2000 from every family in America and gave a few crappy slow DSL.  
<http://www.newnetworks.com/scandals.htm> Now this collection of the worlds biggest welfare bums is back for more!

If the telecoms get their way then they basically "own" the Internet. The incentive will be to packet sniff and traffic shape every bit traveling their corner of the net. They will set up "deals" with certain content providers that will work wonderfully over their own system. Competitor's bit streams will be channeled low priority therefore discouraging users within their system. As each fiefdom traffic shapes and prioritizes as they see fit the differing decisions play havoc with those users tempted to cross the ether outside their ISP's control. Users will be driven to data stream encryption to get around the constraints imposed on them by the prying eyes of their ISP's. Still the ISP can degrade or block competitors to reinforce the value of their own "services". They can offer premium "packages" that give higher payers less latency and prioritized streams within the ISP's fiefdom. As consumers find it increasingly frustrating trying to connect to content outside the system they will frequent the sites paying extortion for premium connection within the system. Lower tiered subscribers will reluctantly "upgrade" to premium tiers to get the Internet to work the way it used to.

Artificially created bandwidth restriction will be too irresistible for ISP's. They have already neglected to invest in the infrastructure of the Internet. The US is ranked about 16th and falling in roll out, speed, and price of broadband world wide. We have diminished economic competitive standing while a handful of Federally anointed duopolies is literally given a license to print money.

If you think "competition" will prevent this from happening you are kidding yourself. There are few choices for broadband for most people and the ones available all know the real money is in content delivery. None of the ISP's are interested in a cut-throat competition to just provide bandwidth!

If this isn't the business plan the telecoms are setting up right now then why the opposition to Net Neutrality? NN will still allow them to have different broadband tiers and flexibility in pricing and usage fees. ISP's can offer all the content and streams they want. It just says treat all the bits equally as they travel through their network. No playing favorites! After all, the ISP's are paid for every bit of bandwidth that is used. If an ISP's system is inadequate to handle the bandwidth they have charged for then the incentive is to supply more. Those that offer compelling content can expect success. No need to rig the system to essentially compete unfairly. So why the vehement position against Net Neutrality by a handful of corporations? If their intentions were good I would think they would be promoting it to avoid the unfair business positioning of potential competitors. Or is there really competition?