Comment on Net Neutrality

I believe that net neutrality is unnecessary. The main reason being there is no solid proof that ISPs are “blocking or degrading traffic from their competitors’ networks” or that they’re throttling bit torrent activity. They’ve even repeatedly said they don’t block customers’ access to the competitors’ web content (of course saying you’re doing something and actually doing it are two very different things). It’s all speculation and fear from the smaller internet providers that have aided the development of the net neutrality concept. The basic ideas behind net neutrality are based on speculations that because there is a limited number of ISPs in the broadband internet market, they will have the power to do as they please with the competitors’ websites. They will have greater control over their lines in the future because they already can charge fees for competitors’ use of them. The common aspect of Obama’s and McCain’s plan is that there should be high speed internet for all, and that it needs to remain open. I believe that there should be high speed internet for all *who need it*. Not everyone uses the internet in the same way, and I think money would be wasted in giving every person high speed access; money that could go to more important things like alternative fuel development, reducing healthcare cost, and improving technology integration in education. It would also allow for more abuse and criminal activity if everyone has a high speed connection.

Competition needs to continue if we the consumers want improved services and advancements in computing technology. If net neutrality is implemented new services, growth, and innovation in computing and communications technology will suffer. We are given a choice as a consumer to pick a service [ISP] based on price, speed, and additional features. With net neutrality, it seems as though all providers and sites would be restricted to operate at the same speed, sharing all possible outlets to do so. This would cause the ISPs to charge more for additional features or limit additional features to the point of you have to pay for each one individually, so they still have a way to make a profit. It would probably come to a point where the consumer picks an ISP randomly because all the lines are shared and average connection speeds and prices are the about the same among each one. People will sacrifice add-ons to save money and there would be a slow steady decline in the growth of internet based commerce because profits are minimal. If the internet remains largely unrestricted and people are still given a real choice we’ll continue to see real growth and innovation.