

My comments favor net neutrality, the open internet.

Allowing internet service providers to throttle access speeds to various websites is an anti-competitive practice. Small websites and small businesses will struggle to gain viewership. Whether we consciously know why or not, our perception of sites as slower and faster will likely associate an unconscious perception of quality with the sites we access, and we will not be drawn to places on the internet that we have a harder time interacting with.

I also agree with making broadband internet a utility. To counter arguments that say utilities are the services that are more necessary, I would point out that not all homes have natural gas, a common utility. The utility analogy is also instructive as to why this makes no sense: suppose the water company promoted increased water flow to powered appliances such as refrigerators and washing machines, but the toilet and sink manufacturers could not pay to promote their products to receive the same flow. It simply would not make sense for the water utility to work this way, because though some usages may be quite important to the consumer, and indeed may constitute even a majority of water consumption, the service of the toilet may be extremely important at times, and the consumer may find him/herself suffering because they did not pay to have equal flow to all home water taps.

Keep the internet available. Freedom of speech will have to be purchased otherwise. The information age will gradually come to an end as it devolves into the enhanced media age. The internet is a world service, and a force for good if we make it so, so we must protect the ability to do this.