

The government must protect our airwaves from the same corporate gatekeepers that have stifled innovation and competition in Internet markets.

Specifically, I currently have two options for high speed internet. Either I pay 60 dollars a month for a cable internet connection, or I pay to set up a phone line (min. 20 dollars a month) and pay 40 dollars a month for DSL. Not only is the service expensive, but you need to purchase company specific modems in order to use their services. It is like purchasing local phone line and only being able to use the phone providers telephones. Now, the idea is ridiculous, but that is what the current companies want and that is what the current companies are doing. The fact that each of these services ends up costing an almost equal amount is not because the market has set this price. Any person with fundamental microeconomics exposure can categorically diagram that this price is not in concourse with competitive market characteristics. Basic high-speed internet should be available similar to how local channels are available. All you should need to have is a computer to access the internet, like all you need is a t.v. for local channels. The fact that there is a huge price barrier to use the internet is astounding. There is no downfall to supporting the allocation of a portion of the spectrum to open, neutral, free and accessible internet. None of the big companies will go bankrupt. They will merely learn more about how the competitive market requires you to actually be competitive.

If the larger communications carriers want to be successful, they need to earn it in a competitive market. No logical argument of any kind can state without fallacy that the telecommunication industry, specifically high-speed internet providers, operate in a competitive market. Currently, the only perks these companies offer for consumers are some software applications that of which freeware versions can be downloaded and, perhaps, they will allow you to have some extra e-mail space or to set up a website. Each of these things can be done without the communications carriers, and these can be done for free. We the people deserve better, but the companies do not have incentive to work for their market share or to foster new and exciting broadband innovations.

Open-access to broadband provides an opportunity to foster innovation the likes of which we cannot currently imagine. Do you really believe you can afford not to embrace this opportunity. Do what is morally and economically just. Give the public the freedom to pursue new and creative ideas without the unnecessary barriers many communications companies would like to impose. Your duty is to the people of the United States of America; your job is to promote the welfare of the people of the United States of America; your job is not to legislate a digital conversion and auction off the left over and valuable frequencies to companies who by the principals of economic theory have a vested interest in fully opposing any incoming competition by creating a barrier to entry into the wireless/broadband/frequency telecommunications market. At the very least, you have a duty to challenge the other countries who have already taken such steps to improve the welfare of their citizens by opening access to broadband internet.

To restore America's leadership in high speed Internet services, the FCC must ensure that the upcoming auction sets aside at least 30 MHz of spectrum for open and non-discriminatory Internet access. This will guarantee that new entrants have the opportunity to enter the market in competition with incumbent providers.

It would be a big mistake to hand over these airwaves to the very same phone and cable companies that dominate the wireline market. We need more competition and innovation, not more of the same. This new wireless spectrum must be open and neutral so that America can build a better Internet for everyone.