

David Sutphen, co-chair of the AT&T-funded Internet Innovation Alliance, says that Net Neutrality is a "distraction" that "only concerns those already online." Sutphen calls Net Neutrality rules "divisive new regulations," which could have "unintended consequences" for those seeking to bridge the digital divide.

Net Neutrality and data carriers both cause me deep concern. Government has not the slightest business in private business, and private business has no business in government. Period!

But, neither side can afford to allow the other free-reign over their affairs, and both attempt to exert just that on the other. When this all clears up, just one solitary monster is left standing, and that monster is Big Brotha' Banker; aka, Bilderberger, aka, Illuminati, aka, BAD NEWS.

Nobama, as those of us with more fiscal responsibility and sustainable money sense are wont to call this excuse for a president, and his puppeteers are Hell-bent on destroying freedom of speech -where that speech counters their agenda, and derailing any use of the Internet -where such use tells the sordid facts about their hidden agenda.

This Net Neutrality political action is part and parcel a cover operation to detract from their real aim to block access to anyone whom they deem against their "1984"-agenda. That fact is so clear that this nation is starting to over-react to their "Change" regime.

The FCC, as all political fronts available to these neo-Global Order elitists have quickly moved into, is stocked with their selected stoolies to effect effortless takeover of vital resistance points to complete destruction of the United States Constitution, annihilation of the freedom of information access being their most important objective, as in every totalitarian regime in history.

The Constitution was formed to provide a blockade by the People to totalitarian government, not as a tool by any government to suppress the People, as this regime repeatedly attempts to use it for.

Today the Internet has reached a point of growth where its sheer bulk of trade can easily bring it down to a complete traffic jam. It's infrastructure is owned and operated by private and public interests whose livelihood and sustainable existence depend heavily, if not completely in many cases, upon its ever-growing size and usability. Even the smallest interruption of its vast array of data services produces economic impact for those affected.

Yet, with all this massive dependency upon the inter-connected data networks, everybody is single-mindedly intent upon increasing their vulnerability to this sole data stream solution.

If any tangible decision comes from this Net Neutrality effort, it will focus on developing increased data capacity, AND, separate solutions for handling data traffic. The proverbial camel had its payload

over-reached by a single straw added to THAT payload, not to a part of the payload it could have transported with the addition of a cart, or reducing packaging weight, or numerous other solutions to getting more delivered with the same infrastructure, or a separate system altogether.

About the only resource that has finite limits is potable water, but even that has numerous alternative solutions, such as solar powered purification and transfer.

My hope for this work of the FCC, and all parties engaged in this issue, is to concentrate on development, NOT limitation.

However, Safety is a more pressing order of relevance than increasing capacity. Not perceived safety limitations, but real-life safety methodologies. Bad-intentioned persons buy and use weapons at will, and no law has, or ever could reduce their use of weapons for harming others. Bad Law and those who promote Bad Law in weapons' access are the same crowd pushing Net Neutrality, and also lobbying government to quash all control on their control of data streams.

Bad weapons Law serves to increase malicious use of weapons, exactly as recent years' records have shown with increasing firearms used for criminal activity, in spite of repressing statistical evidence to derive false figures showing a decrease in their use. So it is with Net Neutrality and other such limiting actions to citizen access to data streams. Rather than promote better safety and quality of living for affected populations, limiting access severely damages personal and population safety. Carrier needs to limit access due to cost of service loads has never produced better customer safety or increased those data-carriers' bottom line.

Rather, curtailing data capacity has caused carriers to lose their businesses as more capable carriers took over their off-loads.

Instead of allowing carriers the luxury of limiting data streams, and the Big Brotha' Banker to control access to information that will harm his World Take-over effort, open the doors at this opportunity to bring in innovative means to create wider bandwidth solutions, parallel transmission systems, and better data handling and packaging methods.

Make effective support proposals that promote replacement of obsolete systems and equipment now proving their worthlessness to continued use. Create a forward-focused consortium where optimizing existing systems is top priority, and creating alternate data traffic lanes is next in priority to safety.

Not simply my humble voice, but my protective freedoms voice, and my spirit of honest entrepreneur-focused solutions. It's been well stated that every perceived problem has at least five effective solutions.

Is this need for increased data bandwidth any different?

Sincerely,

Claude Armstrong