In short, the net must stay neutral or the innovation, education, and creativity of the net will directly suffer. Followed by the consumers and children growing up in a world without truly high-speed internet.

The bottom line is, I pay for internet service at a specific speed. Not internet service to the providers pages, or supported pages, but to the internet, as a whole. Now, what that means, is that any company or individual that also pays for internet service, and say runs their own company/website, perhaps google, firstly, is already paying through the nose for the amount of speed that they require due to the demand of the "internet marketplace". So, for instance. I pay 50$ a month for my high-speed internet, which, on another note, is NEVER capable or likely to achieve the speeds advertised. But that's for another issue. Next, Google pays for their internet service, likely in the tens of thousands per month. They are supposed to be guarenteed a specific rate of service or speed. As am I, from my provider. At that point, us both being paying customers, there are, and should never be, any more transactions, extortions, or requirements that would inflict speed or availablility of thier service, or my ability to access it. Or, read below for the long version.

I purchase internet service for a fee. I am told I am getting so much speed or bandwidth for this purchase. Not having a neutral net means that the speed At&t or whoever my service provider at the time will be charging the websites I wish to visit a fee for them sending the services it offers at the speeds I paid for. Net neutrality guarantees this won't happen and that I as a consumer will not have my services slowed down on purpose by the service provider because they couldn't get some other party to pay them.

Currently, there is a system in placed with the shared bandwidth agreements between providers and owners of the internet's network hubs that allows one network provider to raise funds for the maintenance and usage of their network by another. Of course this is a two way street and the providers feel threatened in that if they overcharge, the other provider will do the same for the traffic coming back through. When Google pays for it's internet, they are paying their provider a fee for the amount of bandwidth they are using. When I use the internet, I am paying a fee to my provider for the bandwidth I am using. When I visit google's site or use one of their service, we both are currently paying for the fees and services. Removing the idea of a neutral network would mean that we would be purposely limited and not getting the services we paid for by the people we are paying in order to have the internet service.

Not preserving net neutrality means the service provider to whom we pay for our service can legally not deliver the speeds and services they promised when advertising and attempting to gain us as a customer. Government has always attempted to protect the consumer from devious acts like bait and switch or outright fraudulent and misleading advertising. This is the effect not preserving a neutral net will have when someone doesn't pay the fees for increased bandwidth and the consumer doesn't get

the internet as their provider advertised. This goes against the history of the government and the basic protections from deceit and dubious business practices.

PS,
Might I remind you that the internet is a growing place for political outreach from candidates to their current or potential constituents. Not having a neutral internet means you could be charged to have your website and internet campaign materials delivered to every state in the country and often times inside the same state and cities fee's on top of your normal internet hosting and such. I suspect that popular sites will have advertisements explaining why their site is slow and who is responsible for the slowdowns too if net-neutrality fails to remain in place. IT is imperative that consumers get what they pay for and the government doesn't legalize the ability of them to not deliver what was promised when signing up for the service. When dealing with internet service providers like SBC/At&t, Qwest, Time Warner, and such who own the networks because of government granted monopolies that existed for a period of time, there isn't a level of competition that would protect consumers and guarantee they get what they paid for without the idea of net-nutrality that is currently in existence today. /end letter.

I think too many opponents of what the telcos want to do don't focus enough on the consumers getting screwed by not having the service they pay for because their provider or the owner of the network their provider uses didn't get the extortion payment. If you buy a car advertised to go 70 MPH and it doesn't get over speeds of 55 MPH, there is recourse because of laws that were designed to protect the consumer. It doesn't make sense to throw this out because some big companies support it. Currently the idea against net neutrality is about competition and profit. Well, that is wrong, there is competition and profit from the current system, the problem is that the competition is a two way street, they need the other network as much as the other network needs them. it limits the ability to rape the wallets of those involved. These network owners want to change that and go after the consumers wallet because they need them more then the ISP's need the websites and consumers. This is all an attempt to shift the amount of power one company holds over another to increase profits without providing anything new.