



---

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**  
**SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY, CRIMINAL JUSTICE, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

June 15, 2014

Dear Federal Communications Commission:

I write in response to the FCC's requests for public comment concerning proceeding 14-28, "Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet." Specifically, I write to express my strong dismay about the proposed changes to the open Internet. I am strongly opposed to any rules or regulations that would allow Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to treat different content disparately. The fact that no particular content has been given preferential treatment (or a "fast lane") has not only allowed the Internet to grow into the marvel it has become, but also has promoted democracy, free speech, and entrepreneurship.

If content providers have to pay higher fees to insure their transmissions reach end-users in the most efficient way possible, such costs would undoubtedly be passed on to end users. I fear that will damage American's economic and intellectual competitiveness for the following reason. As an educator (I am a college professor), I feel it is essential for my students' learning that they be able to access an array of online content without regard to the underlying cost of obtaining it. I teach at a major, public university that serves one of the most ethnically diverse student populations in the country. Many of my students come from very humble backgrounds—so much so that the prospect of higher fees for broadband service would mean that they could not afford Internet access. That, in turn, would negatively affect their learning and their ability to better their station in life through education.

I also serve on the board of directors for a nonprofit society devoted to the study of crime and crime policy. Our organization, like most nonprofits, could never afford to operate effectively if we had to pay ever-increasing fees to insure our own interconnectivity, as well as efficient delivery of the material we provide to our members.

There are also significant public policy reasons for maintaining net neutrality, the most important of which is that net neutrality puts all content providers on a level playing field. If the proposed changes to net neutrality were enacted, start-ups would not be able to compete with existing businesses. In other words, the competition that is supposed to thrive in a free market would be stifled. The deck would be stacked against any person or entity trying something new. The government of the United States should not be in the business of stifling entrepreneurship—a spirit that drives our own economy and global competitiveness.

Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, the proposed changes would lead to discrimination against certain services provided by ISPs. A provider could insure that its preferred content is faster and more reliable than those of competing services. As many others have argued, this would create “a tiered Internet – with a ‘fast lane’ for those who will pay, and a ‘slow lane’ for everyone else.” There is already a shocking level of income inequality in the United States. The FCC should not be fostering a similar type of inequality in information access.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Henry F. Fradella". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Henry F. Fradella, J.D., Ph.D.

Professor of Law, Criminal Justice, and Forensic Studies

Director, School of Criminology, Criminal Justice, and Emergency Management