

Hello, FCC and others reading this,

So, there's a lot of comments here. Not sure what I need to add. Do you FCC guys read and respond to all of them? Also, I'm kinda late getting around to writing this up, so I'll need to be quick to get this in by tonight's deadline. Otherwise I'd try to write more.

I've been using the internet since the 90s, in the days when a single T1 line serviced my entire high school, and was seen to be quite impressive. When I got internet at home I used dial-up internet via a 56.6 kilobit modem. When I eventually got a DSL line with 768 kilobits/second download speeds I was amazed - it was more than 13 times the speed I had been getting. Now I hear that some places are getting gigabit speeds at home, and I can only think, "The sooner the better." The more bandwidth people have, the more opportunities people will have to use the internet in more varied ways.

But what I'm writing about today isn't simply a matter of raw bandwidth. There are more issues to contend with than whether my specific connection is 2Mbits/second or 1000Mbits/second or 56.6Kb/second.

Over the years the internet has become more and more valuable and essential to society. Even if one does not personally use an internet connection, others one relies upon for various goods, services, and information do. Like power, water, roads, and phone service, the internet has evolved over time to the point where it has become an essential utility.

I am very much in favor of the internet. As part of this, I am in favor of Net Neutrality. In support of and to achieve Net Neutrality, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to reclassify all internet service providers as Title II Common Carriers as laid out in the Telecommunications Act of 1934.

Net Neutrality is a term I'd first heard years ago. I wasn't sure what it was, and whether we were supposed to be for or against it. These days, I think that's the beauty of the term - unlike with feel-good terms like "open", you have to actually understand what it means and what's behind it before you can really choose a side. The term itself is... neutral.

In simple terms - I believe that without Title II classification that the ISPs would be able to act like dicks. I do not want them to act like dicks.

Tom Wheeler, the current FCC chairman, has stated in his blog post[1] that he will use Title II "if necessary". However, the FCC cannot use Title II regulations on internet service providers (ISPs) unless they are classified as falling under Title II. Reclassification of ISPs as falling under Title II *is* necessary if the FCC is to be able to use Title II powers "if warranted".

Well, one might ask, in which ways might a non net-neutral ISP act like a dick? To which I might answer: They could block, slow down, or alter data such as content, services, communications, etc. to, from, or to and from, an ISP's customer and a third party. For example, they could block BitTorrent[2][3] or Apple's app called FaceTime[4].

The chairman mentioned legality[5], "That no legal content may be blocked;" - I argue not that "no legal content may be blocked" but that "no content may be blocked." I do not believe that it is within the ISP's jurisdiction to determine whether their customers are using their lines for legal purposes or not, just as it is not within a phone company's jurisdiction to determine whether the purpose of a telephone call is to wish a family member a happy birthday or to try to scam someone. A connection to the internet is as much a telecommunications service as phone service is. If no government warrant has been issued, the ISPs have no business analyzing, listening in on, or interfering with the telecommunications of their customers (and what is to happen if a warrant has been issued I would not think falls within the FCC's jurisdiction, and thus would be a matter for a separate

debate).

So... since I'm running out of time, I'll wrap up by mentioning that I found this blog post <http://ammori.org/2014/05/13/net-neutral-legal-binary-an-etheror-with-no-third-way/> and this FCC filing <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017611807> to be informative reads.

[1] <https://www.fcc.gov/blog/finding-best-path-forward-protect-open-internet>
To quote: "Using every power also includes using Title II if necessary. If we get to a situation where arrival of the "next Google" or the "next Amazon" is being delayed or deterred, we will act as necessary using the full panoply of our authority. Just because I believe strongly that following the court's roadmap will enable us to have rules protecting an Open Internet more quickly, does not mean I will hesitate to use Title II if warranted."

[2] <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2008/08/fcc-rules-against-comcast-bit-torrent-blocking>

[3] <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2010/04/court-rejects-fcc-authority-over-internet>

[4]

<http://www.cnet.com/news/at-t-faces-net-neutrality-complaint-for-facetime-over-3g/>

[5] <https://www.fcc.gov/blog/setting-record-straight-fcc-s-open-internet-rules>