

7521274766.txt

I am in favor of preserving the open Internet as it currently is. Here are my thoughts and opinions on several different aspects of net neutrality relating to the implementation of "fast lanes."

Creating "fast lanes" is dangerous, because as a user, I tend towards websites and content that load quickly, so by creating "fast lanes" for some services, my entire experience with the Internet would change.

As an average user, I would favor the websites that could afford to pay for these "fast lanes" and therefore, a new variable, I'll say S for speed, would be added into the equation of what websites I visit (aka what content I read/watch, where I spend money, etc). This isn't just an issue for me as a user, it's an issue for me as an entrepreneur. Small businesses that cannot afford the "fast lane" would suffer because their success would no longer solely depend on the quality of their services or products, their success equation would also have this new S variable. Well, that is, if ISPs allow them to have it, since ISPs would be able to decide who they want to do business with.

So, if for some reason ISPs ever became more politically involved, they could grant access to the "fast lane" to a website that favors the political party or politicians whom that ISP supports, and conversely, could also tune out the websites and voices that they don't agree with.

Investment would also favor the "fast lane" since it would have more profits associated with it, so the best and new technology would no longer be available for all, it would be exclusive to the fast lane. If net neutrality laws were to change in favor of the new proposals, the "fast lane" would keep up with the newest and best technology available, and over time, the free lane would be left behind at 2014 speeds, which will become incredibly outdated.

In 2004, the average download speed in the US was about 2.2 Mbps, but today it's 24.5 Mbps. That's about 10x faster, and to get an idea of how slow 2.2 Mbps is, consider that the average upload speed is currently 5 Mbps. In 1994, the average download speed was only about .1 Mbps. So on average, in the last twenty years, the average download speeds have increased to be about 10x faster every ten years. This is a HUGE difference. Can you imagine trying to use speeds that slowly now? That's how it would feel to use 2014 speeds in 2024. The "slow lane," and all the business, innovation, and information within it would greatly suffer.

The FCC exists to support "the nation's economy by ensuring an appropriate competitive framework for the unfolding of the communications revolution." If you give in to "fast lanes," that "competitive framework" will be based upon the new equations, the one that include the S (speed) variable. Since $\text{Speed} = \text{Money} * \text{Availability}(1 \text{ or } 0, \text{ granted by the ISP})$, your "appropriate competitive network" would really be based upon money and whether the privately run ISP wants to grant access to it's "fast lane."

This is wrong.

The power does not lie with the ISPs or how much money a website has, it lies with us, the consumers, and we are DEMANDING that you leave the open-Internet as is.

Don't fix something that isn't broken. Don't let giant private companies like Comcast and Verizon manipulate you into believing the open-Internet is broken, just so they can make a profit. And please, don't ignore the voice of the people.