

I have been programming computers since before 1980, when I was in elementary school. In my time, I've greatly utilized dial-up bulletin board systems, then the internet when I went to university, then "the world wide web" when that was crafted. All along I have taken a keen interest in politics.

If there were ever something equivalent to "a dial tone" in our modern times, it's an unfettered internet connection. To propose-- instead of modernizing the concept of a Universal Lifeline for the age-- that a crony-capitalist model of favoritism toward megaconglomerates become an accepted United States policy is simply outrageous and speaks volumes about the point to which we have come as regards "the disconnect" that has come to exist between Congressional representatives along with the Presidency, and the work-a-day, taxpaying citizens to whom they're supposed to be accountable. To allow for already-overly-concentrated corporate forces to be given further free reign to manipulate, in ways that simply bolster their bottom line, the crucial economic backbone that is modern communications, would be travesty in the eyes of historians, present and future. That a mega-lobbyist for one of the behemoth companies gets a Chairmanship at all in a department charged with regulating that industry, is a huge red flag and bespeaks an arrogance of power that can only seem to be "pushing the envelope" of how much anti-populist policy we constituents will indeed put up with, just to what level our political commonsense has been dumbed- and/or beaten-down in our frenetically technological era.

The proposal must be given a stinging rebuke from all who grasp the danger of such a corporatist agenda, and truly democracy-minded tech workers should be empaneled to offer sets of standards by which the original, designed-by-DARPA internet be protected as a right for all, free of "packet shaping", "throttling", and other such intrusive techniques now on the rise which give advantage to the rich when it comes to accessing that invention of the U.S. Government known as "the internet."

Were our Founding Fathers to pay a visit to our modern America, they would doubtless be strident supporters of free-flowing peer-to-peer bandwidth. Cutting out a middleman is surely essential to their vision of efficient business, let alone a centralizing power that greatly facilitates violation of our 4th Amendment whilst maintaining a strong upper hand for a veritable aristocracy of elite billionaires. To use the modern vernacular, what part of "controlling eyeballs" do you not understand and does not compel you to resist?

For purposes of technical advice, I hereby give my imprimatur to the comments submitted by the maintainers of the websites www.techdirt.com and www.freepress.net.