

7521117495.txt

The law of unintended consequences seem to be in full play with this ruling. In theory the guaranteeing of access sounds like a good one, but I see no reason to believe that this ruling will do anything other than having an ISP take their original service and make it their "fast service" while throttling everything else.

This is bothersome to me for all the obvious reasons as a consumer but also problematic for the company I work for. We are a company that provides services over the internet and that service depends on neutrality of ISPs. The services we provide are for medical care for at-home patients, and a lossy or blocked connection would cause potential patient care issues.

(I am not officially a representative for my company so won't list the name here.)

There's a lot more at stake here than just my ability to watch the new season of House of Cards. There are a great number of people who depend on a free and open internet for their livelihoods and the services they offer.