

Does this mean elitist multimillionaires and their millionaire lobbyists and their billion dollar corporations like Google and Verizon perhaps seek to take from the people equal access to the Internet? Apparently these elitist multimillionaire elitist corporate officers have names like elitist Schmidt and elitist Seidenburg?

And their elitist BOD's must likely be included for not standing up to their Presidents in favor of fair and open communications for all citizens. Of course they get stock options, great travel and compensation for being on the BOD so maybe one can understand why they are not about to exercise leavening authority over their out of the box corporate presidents. If so they are to be condemned for not representing the common good in this particularly crucial matter.

It is mandatory that the public be given equal access to the Internet. To not do so clearly undermines democracy much the same way as that witless Roberts and Co. ridiculously ruled that corporation and their coffers were individuals like you and me for certain political purposes. For example the potential purchase of politicians with "contributions?"

For corporations to try to dominate the regulatory scope of the FCC by defining their authority is another example why democracy is failing and an elitist run society is our fate unless we change course. The FCC must not only face down these evil corporations they must punish them by making sure they get what they do not want. Equality with citizens. One hopes that none of the FCC decision makers has relatives in the employment of for profit lobbying firms or corporations involved or potentially involved in this case. And one hopes they have no likelihood themselves to push the revolving door during the rest of their careers.

High performance communications for BP but high performance for me too. Citizens, not artificial entities (Robert's and Co suck eggs legally even as they do irreparable damage to the first amendment), should be the priority of Congress, and the FCC in the decision making process. (See Citizens United v Federal Election Commission)

To relegate all those who communicate over the net, except for the rich and powerful corporations, to third class status vitiates one of the most powerful advantages of the net for maintaining communications between non profits and between citizens and their government. Such communications have become a vital part of modernity, of our civil society. Since corporations know this, they do not need me to tell them, it is clear that the effects on democracy of their actions are not an important part of their decision making matrix. Because if citizen communications are slower, less dependable, or more costly, it will be those essences of democracy, transparency and openness which will clearly suffer. So once again we give up another building block in freedom and democracy so corporations can cut deals with broadband suppliers just so they can make money and gleefully

bully others to the side? Why?

I would nationalize the broadband suppliers because the public airways are ours, not theirs and the broadband suppliers and the corporations clearly have ideas inconsistent with the public interest. Are they to be condemned for boldly negotiating deals to negatively affect access for John Q Public in favor of the Seidenbug/Schmidt ilk?

I am particularly surprised at Schmidt who I always envisioned as a great supporter of governmental transparency and openness. A man with great ideas on how to cause this to work better. From a corporation who stood up to the Chinese efforts to censor when Obama and Clinton would not. I guess he is not the man I thought he was and neither is Google the corporation I thought it was. My bad.

Finally technical speaking why is it that if corporations want faster speeds and so do non profits, small corporations and individual citizens, why is the technology not here to give it, on equal terms, to everybody who wants it. Even Robert's everybody's?

And Yes I want the Chair of the FCC to please respond to this communication and publicize this communication along with his/her response in your public access file on this matter. And not in a pro forma letter. Please describe your views of errors in my perspective, facts, or thinking because this matter is far too complicated for people of my background to understand it's total complexity.

<http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/upload/display?z=l9ruq>