

7521151949.txt

There are a myriad of reasons (more than I can or will describe) why this proceeding is wrong and will inevitably cause great harm to the Internet we are currently familiar with.

Allowing ISPs to double charge for internet services is not only disruptive to both consumers and providers, it's bad for both our national and global economy. Smaller companies have issues competing due to the proposed implementation of a "marketing exposure and bandwidth tax" imposed by ISPs and regulated by the FCC. Those familiar with how business related services in relation to traffic and bandwidth are concerned know that you can currently buy different tiered services that are based on the amount of traffic being generated/received. This is the exact argument the FCC is making FOR the advancement of this legislation. These types of services currently exist and are already operational.

The FCC's proposal is redundant and unnecessary. It is being used to redefine how the Internet works and it is wrong.

Another mentionable issue is that ISPs can force undesired information from being displayed or available via an accidental denial of service caused by traffic/bandwidth favoritism. This is a huge issue concerning freedom of speech and expression. The Internet is an embodiment of one of America's most mentionable rights-free speech. When speech or the medium delivering the speech is disrupted (i.e. Net Neutrality being violated), America and its policy makers as a whole are sending a message to the rest of the world: "Free speech is no longer free."

I propose, like many others, that the FCC classify ISPs as common carriers to preserve the Internet we are familiar with and prevent these types of issues from reoccurring.

It is my great hope that Net Neutrality remains intact and that the Internet we know today does not become a memory of the past.

I've attached a variety of related links below that describe more of why the proposed legislation is harmful:

<http://motherboard.vice.com/read/not-even-the-fcc-likes-the-fccs-proposed-net-neutrality-rules>

<http://gizmodo.com/the-grim-future-of-a-world-without-net-neutrality-1501161513/1566814900/+ace>

<http://www.savetheinternet.com/net-neutrality-resources>

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2014/01/drop-regulatory-hammer-on-internet-providers-says-former-fcc-commissioner/>