

7521361844.txt

I sent these comments out before, and I'm sending them out again in the hopes that they will be seriously considered before making a decision that could be disastrous to both consumers and content providers (of which I am both)

1) There is no benefit to the market in allowing giant ISPs like Comcast and Verizon to restrict data access depending on who can pay them bigger fees. In fact, giving these ISPs the power to control data will kill small businesses like mine and my colleagues' who rely on the internet for the bulk of our marketing and communication with customers. If we and others are shoved into the digital equivalent of Cable Access, the small profit we are able to currently generate will vanish under new overhead costs and essentially kill our businesses.

2) The new rules that are being proposed are an attempt to fix a system that's not broken. The spirit of Net Neutrality, the concept of a level playing field, has allowed small start-ups a chance at success equal to larger, more established companies. These new proposals do nothing more than take that level playing field away and stifle the innovation that has fueled the net for these past decades.

3) A fear that I've heard from my own representatives is the fear of government interference into the internet. But don't these new rules give corporations the unrestrained ability to interfere? I can vote out my representatives. I can't vote out CEOs unless I'm a shareholder.

4) Major players in the Internet field are dead set against this. Google, Amazon, Mozilla, Netflix have gone on record supporting the continuation of open, unrestricted internet access (<http://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-netflix-google-and-others-put-pressure-on-fcc-over-net-neutrality-2014-5>)

5) Business and life now move at the speed of data. Yet, we are currently ranked 31st in the world for download speeds. Hong Kong ranks at the top. A country with a long history of Human Rights abuse, a country that heavily restricted access to Google on the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square Massacre to keep information from its citizens, has substantially faster speeds than America. Supporting further speed restrictions is counterproductive and senseless.

6) By allowing ISPs to develop a tiered system, you are in effect allowing them to manipulate the market, driving consumers away from less mainstream products and services simply because the businesses that provide those products and services can't pay the fees that larger companies can afford. This is Anti-Capitalist at its core. If Dupont went around shutting down roads to businesses that sell their products, only opening those roads up if said businesses paid a fee, would that be ethical or legal? There's a term that describes this kind of practice: Extortion.

7) Both Comcast and Verizon have the lowest-rated Customer Satisfaction scores in the country, yet most consumers HAVE to buy from them because of a disturbing lack of competition in the marketplace. Handing them further power over consumers is unwise. We need to work on OPENING access to the 'net, not restricting it.

For these reasons and more, I am asking the FCC to re-classify the internet as a public utility to keep it free and unrestricted.

As it stands, 86% of Americans who currently use the internet are in support of continuing the unrestricted ability to access it. I would remind Chairman Wheeler that he is acting as a representative of the American people, not the ISPs.

Caleb Paschal  
Combatives/Self-Defense Instructor

7521361844.txt

Science of Self-Defense  
615-669-3478  
[www.scienceofselfdefense.com](http://www.scienceofselfdefense.com)