
The paper summarizes different perspectives discussed in the articles, Am I The Only Techie Against Net Neutrality (Forbes, MAY 14, 2014) and Court Backs Rules Treating Internet as Utility, Not Luxury (New York Times, JUNE 14, 2016) regarding Net Neutrality and Democracy.

View Against

The view against is that government is not efficient in managing the service because, by design, it is slow, stifling to innovation, and financially not an efficient management organization in comparison to private organizations. The author proposes wanting more freedom, more opportunity, and by letting the free market 'self-regulate' we end up with more for less.

The view against uses the NSA argument in support why government should not have Net Neutrality. I disagree with this argument and support laws that give certain government agencies the needed the authority, tools, and access (both breadth and depth) needed to keep America safe.

The Courts Rule for Net Neutrality

The *Times* piece discusses the Court's support for Net Neutrality, as it "...emphasized the importance of the internet as an essential communications and information platform for consumers. They argue that broadband providers could degrade the quality of downloads and streams of online services to extract tolls from web companies or to promote unfairly their own competing services or the content of partners."

Effect on Democracy

I am for Net Neutrality and feel that public policy should support the views that Apple's open letter to the FCC points out (referenced below). The letter supports Net Neutrality for the combined positive points by consumer choice, transparency, competition, investment and innovation, and no paid fast lanes.

Part of having freedom is protecting the freedom of others. Net Neutrality policy should be politically agnostic and not harm the freedom, innovation, and competition that supports America's Republic.

Additional References

[Apple's Letter to FCC](#)