

I rely on the Internet as a public platform for free speech, equal opportunity, economic growth and innovation. Without vital Net Neutrality protections, companies like Verizon and Comcast, which have a commercial incentive to limit the free-flowing Web, can decide whether I will have a voice online. These companies should not have the power to determine my fate on the Internet.

* * *

I personally would stop using the Internet altogether if it became an exclusive environment dictated by the small fraction of the population who controls the majority of wealth. Such a situation would be nearly as bad as the repressive measures China places on its Internet use, which Google itself was so stalwartly opposed to not so long ago. The Internet accounts for a large percentage of my communications, information, news and commerce. While there are plenty of right wing politicians and pundits who rally against excessive governmental control, this would simply put the same type of heavy-handed control in the hands of this nation's corporations, who have a much smaller concern for the well-being of this nation's citizens who simply wish to live their lives as a truly free individual would. Proposals such as the one currently being put forward is a dangerous step towards the destruction of that freedom.

The FCC can't cut private deals that would hand control over the Internet to a few massive phone and cable companies. Any compromise that allows Internet providers to build toll lanes online is not real Net Neutrality.

The agency must stand with the public and protect consumer access to the most important communications medium of our time. The FCC must regain its resolve to protect Net Neutrality on wired and wireless networks. Please reclassify broadband as a "telecommunications service" and keep the Internet open and free of corporate gatekeepers.

* * *

Should the Internet be limited in its scope of usage, and its users' choices be restricted, one of two results are highly probable. One of which would be the economic structure on which Verizon's and Google's aspirations (as well as that of the rest of the country) rest upon would collapse. Fewer choices not only equates to low consumer confidence but also a non-competitive market in which the population able to afford services we have come to know as basic will continue to dwindle. Without the consumer, a company is nothing. When the company fails, the citizens' needs can no longer be met. The cycle needs to be maintained if our treasured democratic life is to be preserved.

The other result would resemble a totalitarian fascist state in which all competition is eliminated and a single outlet for a ubiquitous service determines its content. Instead of the classic 'state-run' media, we would have 'corporate-run' media, only allowing for channels that best serve their own financial

interests. Neither avenue promises a bright future for a majority of this population - and make no mistake, it is a majority - and would be very much incongruous to a democracy.

The principals that this nation was founded upon start with "government of the people, by the people and for the people". As an agency of the government, be of the the people and fulfill your charge to serve their will.