The recent tragic decision by The U.S. Supreme Court on Citizen's United which undid democracy emboldens big cable and phone company ISPs to suggest Net Neutrality violates their free speech which is bogus -- by the way the Internet is more interactive than radio or TV ever were -- it encourages participation, dissent, and democracy. The Open Internet encourages free speech on the part of users. We just pay a monthly fee for access and have unlimited equal access to all Internet websites but big ISPs want to be able to change all of that. They dislike the idea of being forced to deliver every email message even messages by consumer rights groups criticizing them etc. The Open Internet threatens their legacy business model where in the past they would co-op and monetize technologies for corporate gain at the expense of the public interest.

Big ISPs like Comcast want to be able to censor what we write in our emails and publish to the Web. Let's say I write an email about Comcast criticizing them for anti competitive, and anti consumer policies and I happen to be using Comcast's email service to send the message. Comcast wants to be able to reject my message because they think its unfair for them to be forced to deliver a message criticizing them.

When the U.S. Postal Service delivers letters every day to mailboxes they cannot filter out and decide which letters to deliver and which not to. If I want to send a letter to someone they cannot refuse to deliver my letter because they don't like what I have to say. They don't have a free speech right to do such a thing. If the Post Office cannot prioritize and discriminate against what mail is delivered ISPs cannot either.

The Information Superhighway needs to be protected -- using this analogy the Internet should be kept open and accessible like our federal highways -- I'm not advocating that government control the Internet but the Internet be open and we should be able to access any website without corporate gatekeepers on the Web. A majority of our nation's roads and highways have no toll booths and even those that do aren't owned by corporations that can set arbitrarily high prices. The way we do this is to return to some form of government regulation that existed in the past. That the FCC focus on the parts of the 1996 Telecommunications Act that provided them the power to mandate competition among broadband Internet access providers (the 1996 Telecommunications Act was a blueprint by Congress for the FCC to use to ensure a vibrant and competitive broadband Internet access market would continue in the U.S. instead the FCC ignored that portion of the Act and focused on another area in the Act dealing with de-regulation to completely de-regulate the market and allow big companies to consolidate) and the FCC revise its definition of broadband Internet access changed tragically in 2002 by the Bush Administration from an information service back to an information service using a telecommunications service to give them more regulatory clout to protect the Internet. Before 2002 the FCC defined broadband Internet access like this but it was changed in 2002. We also need to restore Net Neutrality protections lifted in 2005 when the Internet Policy Statement of the

Bush FCC was released without nondiscriminatory service mandated for the freedom of Internet users.

We need wholesale open access and wireless Net Neutrality for mobile phones so the mobile Internet has the same nondiscriminatory protections as the rest of the Internet and cellular phone users can access the legal mobile applications of their choice over their carrier's network even if it is a VOIP app like Skype or Vonage Mobile for iPhone or Blackberry that competes with the carrier's network in offering call services. For example, AT&T Wireless cannot block apps it dislikes because they compete with AT&T's offerings like Skype for iPhone thus restricting such apps technically capable of working over 3G to Wifi. Wholesale open access likewise would apply the benefits of the Carterfone ruling to wireless and say cellular phones have to be opened up so you can use any phone with any carrier of your choice and that can result in increased competition. Breaking up business and financial monopolists in the cable and telecommunications industry (separating AT&T from SBC Communications & Bell South again; and AT&T Wireless from Cingular Wireless) etc and banning further mega mergers like Comcast NBC Universal -- which poses a huge conflict of interest with a company owning the pipes for distributing TV channels and Internet access owning content. Already Comcast with their TV Everywhere scam want to force us to bundle digital cable TV with broadband Internet access if we want access to video services online.

That is unacceptable and wrong. By the way cable prices have been rising for too long. Cable companies with Internet and TV services have a conflict of interest between allowing fast Internet and access to video sites and blocking them without Net Neutrality so we can be forced to pay for their expensive digital cable TV offerings as well.

Comcast and companies like AT&T claim they don't make enough money to make massive network upgrades and improve infrastructure to accommodate higher bandwidth and provide access to more users like unserved users -- in poor rural areas that are on the wrong side of the digital divide -- or underserved users who have Internet but their high speed Internet is slower than it should be. Yet they make millions and even billions of dollars of profit each year and have enough money to pay special interest lobbyists to fight Net Neutrality rules that would benefit users. Like U.S. Senator Al Franken said he feels Comcast would say or promise anything to win support for the merger but afterward if allowed permission to merge might break those promises. Comcast's word should not be trusted.

Net Neutrality is essential to free speech, equal opportunity and economic innovation in America. Since the FCC removed this basic protection in 2005, the top executives of phone and cable companies have stated their intention to become the Internet's gatekeepers and to discriminate against Web sites that don't pay their added tolls.
This fundamental change would end the open Internet as we know it. It would damage my ability to

connect with others, share information and participate in our 21st century democracy and economy. The FCC must ensure that broadband providers do not block, interfere with or discriminate against any lawful Internet traffic based on its ownership, source or destination.