

7521734552.txt

The FCC has a responsibility to represent the voice of those who would be harmed by allowing massive telecommunications companies to charge money for access to internet service. This includes small startup companies, and especially web-based startups, who are driving economic growth in the United States with their innovation in the technology space. It also includes consumers who may be pushed out of access to internet service because companies who can afford it use up a larger proportion of bandwidth. In order for the United States to function as a real democracy, its citizens must have reliable access to public information and educational resources. This introduces the third arena that would be affected by a failure by the FCC to regulate large ISPs: education. Much of education is moving online, or at least relying substantially on online resources. If Verizon or AT&T controlled access to broadband with fees, what would stop them from pressuring schools to accept advertisements as part of online courses? Why would they not financially "encourage" schools to build courses requiring students to use devices sponsored by their company or their partners? What would students ultimately learn about the role of business in society? After the crash of 2008, do we REALLY want to risk our next generation not understanding their responsibility as consumers and citizens in holding large institutions accountable for their actions? The FCC is the organization to address this risk. The "future of the internet" is not the only thing at stake here. It is the future of our ability as a society to engage in informed dialogue and to sustain innovation.