

7521181363.txt

I am writing to comment on the FCC's recent proposed changes to net neutrality. In particular, the decision to enact a 'fast lane' in which companies would be allowed to charge for faster internet broadband access.

As a concerned citizen I feel it is imperative that broadband access, and internet access in general, remain unfettered and classified as a Title II telecommunications service under the Communications Act.

Prioritizing one type of internet traffic in favor of another does not promote net neutrality. Nor does creating a 'fast lane' for those who are able to pay a steeper price.

The internet is a medium through which information is broadcast and transmitted. It is the 21st century equivalent of an open forum at a town meeting. Whether or not a citizen participates it is of his or her own accord, but the right of every citizen to participate it should not be infringed upon.

A corporate entity cannot limit participation at these town meetings to only those who can afford to attend. A corporate entity also should not have the power to limit a citizen body's right to free speech, assembly, free press and petition for government address of grievances by limiting broadband access.

There are a bunch of very important issues to be addressed here:

1. Should there be an outright ban on fast lanes?

In my opinion, there definitely should be because it greatly increases the difficulty of competing with the established giants for startup companies. IE: Giants become monopolies, which last I heard was illegal.

2. Should broadband access be classified as a Title II common carrier?

I believe that it should. There is way too much cheating of the general public being done by ISPs; we are paying way too much for the pathetic service they provide. How is it that the country that discovered the Internet has slower speeds than a country like Estonia? The richer seem to get richer and the poorer poorer with every over priced plan and strangling service.

3. Should the new Open Internet provisions also cover wireless (mobile) broadband?

I believe that it should. I do not understand why there should be a difference between the two things. Why was there a difference in the first place? Both cover the access to the WWW.

4. Should the head of the FCC be a former lobbyist for telecom and cable industries?

I REALLY do not think he should be, especially after his recent proposal. Why would he enact policies that would be disadvantageous to the companies that have treated him so well in the past? He has made a lot of money working with them and it does not require a huge leap of faith to guess that he probably still is making a lot of money working with them. If so, that is called corruption. Favoritism has no right to be played by the head of an government section.

5. Is it a little too convenient that the FCC's proposals have been incredibly advantageous for the industries that the head of the FCC used to lobby for so vigorously?

Yes... If there was ever a rather outright power play and corruptive policies being shown, it is in this area. Keep enjoyment and politics separate; just because you play golf with a man doesn't mean you need to give him a position of authority. Especially if he is going to misuse it to further the companies that he was working for with added gain to himself but a severe restriction on the people of America.

6. In spite of decades of dealing with FCC regulations on telephone lines, the

7521181363.txt

telecom industry has failed to provide specific examples of these "burdens and restrictions". It is simply an empty threat from an industry desperate to avoid being told that it cannot do whatever it fancies.

7. Comcast is legally obliged to abide by the old neutrality guidelines until 2018. Yet it has no problem boasting that its merger with TWC will result in faster and superior Internet service. If these rules are so burdensome, how can Comcast pull off this magic trick?

I am not entirely sure, but I definitely think that ISPs have way too much power to do all sorts of questionable, unethical and straight up evil things. People hate TWC and Comcast with such fervor for good reason. I expect to be respected for the hard money that I pay with, not be treated as just ATMs for big corporations that want to further take our money and give only below sub-par services.

8. Much of the innovation that ISPs claim will be harmed by further regulation has nothing to do with what ISPs do. Furthermore, many of the companies responsible for these innovations have publicly called on the FCC to rethink Wheeler's proposal. Why? Because these more regulations would PROTECT these innovators and cost ISPs a little bit of money obtained by questionable ethics.

9. For a country as wealthy and prosperous as the US, it is embarrassing that our internet speeds are NOWHERE near the speeds of even some 3rd world countries.

I strongly believe that it would not take a huge monetary investment to improve our network speeds but ISPs in the US have some sort of understanding that cheating the public out of faster speeds is advantageous to them. I also believe regulation would help our entire country here. For starters, do not let these companies call what they are providing broadband or "high speed internet".

As a consumer, I once again strongly urge the FCC to classify broadband access as a Title II telecommunications service under the Communications Act.