These are my own personal words I would like to request be aired out to someone official who will hear this in support of my position.
I was at my mother's the other day, and I saw a commercial -- AT&T sponsored it, and it was indeed a very clever commercial. "Commercial" -- intended to sell me on a product or idea, propagandistic in nature. This was no simple ad for a material. This was no "moral" that was being delivered. It was amusing to watch, for 30 seconds, but that's the nature of it.

Now, I DO support the idea carried therein: that the Internet should become a global medium, that everyone who desires access to it should have free and simple access to it. Not necessarily sponsored by AT&T nor any one corporation. However, the Internet would need a complete redesign, unless we came to a true upper limit of the current technologies we have in place.

The issues of delivering energy across distances has come up, and the Internet is simply another energy. What need might a farmer might have or want? Perhaps there are people out there who live just fine without it -- tribes in the Rainforests, people whose social lives are predominant over their use of the constant computerization of the world. And there is also the up-and-coming question about the sheer population of, say, China, who are about to undergo an "Industrial Revolution" in our modern day and age -- what about their Internet presence?

There are many issues of security which would present themselves in a completely free Internet -- and it is relatively reasonable to understand that not everything could be monitored, and transparency itself has a certain opacity -- that is to say, as much as we try to reveal our processes, we still have our human natures designing something that will have its own underlying motives. The biases we carry will always be revealing itself through the things we invent and engineer.

The Internet has become the first "global" connector, truly, developing our serious global economy and enabling all sorts of marvelous communication features -- instant communication across vast distances beyond the speed of simple classic telephone capabilities, and more. This is truly a "medium" -- it stands in the middle as a communications crossroads in our day and age. Further, there is no -serious- risk of cross-data gluttage -- data can cross as freely and as often as any user can put it out.

What AT&T, Comcast, &c. are suggesting is to put a stop-light with a forced low-speed lane in the approach to that crossroads. Now, all data will have to be assessed -- does it belong to a "high-paying" versus a "low-paying" user? Who is using it and how?

The fact that data is being shared in various manners, and varying types of data mean that these slowdowns -- artificed and human in nature -- would make potentially useful things which can be done here today, April 2010, impossible or difficult. To limit our potentials is risky business. We would not

have the ingenuity of the modern electronic world today if we had put stops, blocks, and road-cones in the way of progress. And especially if there was corporate influence in those realms.

True, there is a lot of data in the streams crossing the Internet today. And there are varying issues of economy about the transmission of "how much" data across "how much" of distances -- but these issues are world-wide. The United States of America alone cannot take this issue into its own hands any more than China can; nor could the dozens of European governments. Further, these issues are not about "the Internet" alone.

The corporations which regulate the flow of electricity are being forced to evaluate the cost-benefits of how much electricity they can send over how much distance and what pay-off they are getting. Truly, the problem is economy -- what is most "economical"? Can we restrict ourselves in order to profit? The corporate pay becomes based on how much we can pull from the "consumer".

With power over the Internet, corporations can put companies which can pay off with more second-hand consumer money than the individual startup and incorporated consumers could pay individually. The companies which are delivering service are discovering their challenges in this, and they are seeking extra "pay" from this idea -- but these energies, peoples' hard work and labor, are going to misappropriated -- and not recycled into the consumers' hands -- because there is no way to say "you paid this much, you get this much Internet".

Further, these ideas will charge the companies which deliver Internet data -- Youtube, for example, would have to pay AT&T if it wanted people on AT&T to get their videos at "full-speed" or pay AT&T on a sliding scale based on how much video was sent to the users every month. Now, that's a lot of data. But, let's take the now-defunct, formerly Yahoo-owned Geocities -- this was a site that had user-generated content only, was not Web 2.0 interactive, was not a serious data bandwidth hog, but was simply not profiting Yahoo enough -- and thus, they cut it -- this is an example of a site that was getting -some- paid users for the frills, but not enough. And when it was a small start-up, if they had needed to pay 20 different AMERICAN companies to make sure their data was delivered at full-speed, it would be like the days of dial-up. And this is hinting at a broader question -- how could you even THINK to demand "retributive" pay for ALL sites hosted outside of the American e!

conomy?

In conclusion, I think that this is a terrible idea. The Internet will continue to emerge in the ways it has been, so long as it proceeds forth unhindered and untethered. The companies which are bringing this forth are trying to solve problems of delivery, and need to explore more inventive avenues of successful data delivery, in the hopes of innovating the next "radio", "television VHF/UHF", "cable", "digital", "fiber-optic", or "bluetooth" of our modern era of technology. This is a world which is

changing, and these companies are trying to resolve their losses by sticking to the older methods and restraining others while they "catch up" or trying to ride on the shirt-tails of another, when they should be inventing their own new "medium" which perhaps will ensure that corporate restriction should never have to hold back progress again.

This is why I think that the fundamental arguments of this case are flawed. And this is why I think this restrictive case should be ruled against, in the favor of the hope and belief that we can make progress through positive and creative innovation and venture rather than remaining stagnant in the "status quo".

The form letter as recommended follows:

--

The FCC must reclassify broadband as a "telecommunications service" so that it can keep the Internet open and free of corporate gatekeepers.

Without vital Net Neutrality protections and the ability to enforce them, the Internet will cease to be a public platform for free speech, equal opportunity, economic growth and innovation. Instead, companies like ATï¼†T, Verizon and Comcast, which have a commercial incentive to limit the free-flowing Web, will decide whose voices are heard.

You still have the power to protect the public interest. Please stand with us and keep the Internet in the hands of the people who use it every day.