
Subject: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 03:07:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.savetheinternet.com>

It's quite an interesting read. What do ya'll think about it?

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 03:10:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I already know about this, and I think it's the dumbest thing ever.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 04:23:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Congress is pushing a law that would abandon the Internet's First Amendment -- a principle called Network Neutrality that prevents companies like AT&T, Verizon and Comcast from deciding which Web sites work best for you -- based on what site pays them the most. If the public doesn't speak up now, our elected officials will cave to a multi-million dollar lobbying campaign.

If that's true, then how is it the dumbest thing ever, Icedog? Also, I would like you to note that that's all I read; I'm kinda busy at the moment.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 06:11:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

z310 wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 00:23Quote:Congress is pushing a law that would abandon the Internet's First Amendment -- a principle called Network Neutrality that prevents companies like AT&T, Verizon and Comcast from deciding which Web sites work best for you -- based on what site pays them the most. If the public doesn't speak up now, our elected officials will cave to a multi-million dollar lobbying campaign.

If that's true, then how is it the dumbest thing ever, Icedog? Also, I would like you to note that that's all I read; I'm kinda busy at the moment.

I think he means what's happening to the Internet is dumb... O:

(I hope)

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [havoc9826](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 06:15:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like Jon Stewart's take on it.

Edit: And the follow-up.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 07:35:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't mean Internet neutrality itself.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [z310](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 14:06:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 03:35 I didn't mean Internet neutrality itself.

Oh, OK. I'm sorry.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 17:13:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Imagine if you're in a long line at the checkout at a grocery store.; let's say it's the only line. Now let's say that every few moments, someone else is able to cut in line, just because they paid the store a little extra. Is that fair to you? No, not really. Now imagine that happening on the Internet. Is that fair to you? No, not really. There are people that can't afford to pay the store extra, just to save a little time.

Edit:

In another example I've just thought of, think of the Internet as roadways. Sure, there are private roadways that have tolls to use. Alternately, there are public roadways which everyone can use, freely. They're paid with and maintained by taxes, vehicle registration costs, insurance, and the like. There's still congestion at major highways and intersections during peak hours, but everyone has to sit through the congestion equally, with the only exception being emergency vehicles. Would it be fair to you, if someone else were to use emergency vehicles as a means of bypassing all of the congestion?

The Internet's backbones (highways, etc...) are free to use. But to pay for them, your service provider already pays a fee to the telecom in order to maintain the lanes. You already pay a fee to

your telecom in order to use their lanes. In many cases, your service provider and telecom are one, and so your telecom is making even more. Sure, there are some private networks... but most private networks are exactly that: private.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 17:25:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Internet is a series of tubes! If we don't make a second part that you have to pay for, the tubes will get clogged up like someone who's eaten one too many hamburgers!

>_>

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 17:51:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The telephone companies have every right to manipulate/throttle/tier traffic on their private networks. Let free market sort it out instead of relying on more pointless government regulation to solve it.

"Creating legislation for a problem that has yet to affect the market is getting the cart before the horse. I believe it's appropriate for the FCC to stay engaged in any potential conflicts between content providers and network operators. But there's very little reason for onerous government regulation -- particularly with regard to the Internet." -- Sen. Craig Thomas.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 17:53:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What free market? Isn't broadband service in many areas a monopoly?

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:03:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 18:51The telephone companies have every right to manipulate/throttle/tier traffic on their private networks. Let free market sort it out instead of relying on more pointless government regulation to solve it.

"Creating legislation for a problem that has yet to affect the market is getting the cart before the horse. I believe it's appropriate for the FCC to stay engaged in any potential conflicts between content providers and network operators. But there's very little reason for onerous government regulation -- particularly with regard to the Internet." -- Sen. Craig Thomas.

The point that you fail to realize is that more than 90% of the Internet's lines are public assets, exactly like the telephone lines are public assets. Most of the lines were paid for by public subsidies.

What right do the companies have to privatize public works?

I recommend you read this document.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality

Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:06:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Availability of a service in a specific place has what to do with free market? If it becomes "unusable" due to this throttling (that most people still have yet to understand), there will be alternative services that step in and fill the void. Net neutrality will die in DC, repeatedly, because the Constitution and all the Amendments work as designed to protect capitalism, private competition, and rights.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality

Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:15:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kanezor wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 14:03xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 18:51The telephone companies have every right to manipulate/throttle/tier traffic on their private networks. Let free market sort it out instead of relying on more pointless government regulation to solve it.

"Creating legislation for a problem that has yet to affect the market is getting the cart before the horse. I believe it's appropriate for the FCC to stay engaged in any potential conflicts between content providers and network operators. But there's very little reason for onerous government regulation -- particularly with regard to the Internet." -- Sen. Craig Thomas.

The point that you fail to realize is that more than 90% of the Internet's lines are public assets, exactly like the telephone lines are public assets. Most of the lines were paid for by public subsidies.

What right do the companies have to privatize public works?

I recommend you read this document.

They're not attempting to charge for access to public lines. What do you think connects to those public lines? Bingo. Private networks.

I'd suggest further looking at the concept of 'carriers,' and how telephone companies plan on implementing non-neutral features. It's going to affect large companies such as Google and have very little impact on most consumers.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:21:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 13:06 Availability of a service in a specific place has what to do with free market? If it becomes "unusable" due to this throttling (that most people still have yet to understand), there will be alternative services that step in and fill the void. Net neutrality will die in DC, repeatedly, because the Constitution and all the Amendments work as designed to protect capitalism, private competition, and rights. Good job completely ignoring everything that's being said.

How can alternative services "step up to fill the void" if they can't afford the fees to connect in? Telecommunications companies spent many many more billions of dollars in merging (eg, monopolizing) rather than expanding. Fewer companies means it's harder for startups to do competitive business.

Net Neutrality won't die in DC "because the Consitution and all Amendments work as designed". It will die in DC because people fail to encourage it. When the Constitution was written, it was written for the rights of the people, not for the "rights" of capitalism.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:28:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kanezor wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 14:21 How can alternative services "step up to fill the void" if they can't afford the fees to connect in?

Seriously. Learn how the Internet works before arguing about government regulation of it. There's no magical toll box people need to use to "connect in," and bandwidth providers aren't remotely monopolized.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 18:39:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 13:15 Kanezor wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 14:03 xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 18:51 The telephone companies have every right to manipulate/throttle/tier traffic on their private networks. Let free market sort it out instead of relying on more pointless government regulation to solve it.

"Creating legislation for a problem that has yet to affect the market is getting the cart before the horse. I believe it's appropriate for the FCC to stay engaged in any potential conflicts between content providers and network operators. But there's very little reason for onerous government regulation -- particularly with regard to the Internet." -- Sen. Craig Thomas.

The point that you fail to realize is that more than 90% of the Internet's lines are public assets, exactly like the telephone lines are public assets. Most of the lines were paid for by public subsidies.

What right do the companies have to privatize public works?

I recommend you read this document.

They're not attempting to charge for access to public lines. What do you think connects to those public lines? Bingo. Private networks.

I'd suggest further looking at the concept of 'carriers,' and how telephone companies plan on implementing non-neutral features. It's going to affect large companies such as Google and have very little impact on most consumers.

Can you guarantee that it will have "very little" impact on most consumers? I doubt it.

I have, in fact, read a fair amount on how the companies plan to implement non-neutral features. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/30/A R2005113002109_pf.html William L. Smith, chief technology officer for Atlanta-based BellSouth Corp., told reporters and analysts that an Internet service provider such as his firm should be able, for example, to charge Yahoo Inc. for the opportunity to have its search site load faster than that of Google Inc. Is it right for the ISP to tell you, the customer that you, the customer can access one site faster than another? Now try reading this:

Quote:

In 2004, North Carolina ISP Madison River blocked their DSL customers from using any rival Web-based phone service.

In 2005, Canada's telephone giant Telus blocked customers from visiting a Web site sympathetic to the Telecommunications Workers Union during a contentious labor dispute.

Shaw, a major Canadian cable, internet, and telephone service company, intentionally downgrades the "quality and reliability" of competing Internet-phone services that their customers might choose -- driving customers to their own phone services not through better services, but by rigging the marketplace.

In April, Time Warner's AOL blocked all emails that mentioned www.dearaol.com -- an advocacy

campaign opposing the company's pay-to-send e-mail scheme.

I don't know about you, but I most certainly cry foul in each and every one of those. When you pay for a service, you expect it to work. What right do the companies have to block sites, just because it has a conflict of interest? What right do the companies have to block emails, for the same reason? What happened to free speech (which I'll point out is protected by the First Amendment!)?

Sure, half of those cases are from Canada, and I don't know Canada's laws. But then again, the other half are from the United States: North Carolina ISP... America Online...

Edit:

xptek wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 19:28 Kanezor wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 14:21 How can alternative services "step up to fill the void" if they can't afford the fees to connect in?

Seriously. Learn how the Internet works before arguing about government regulation of it. There's no magical toll box people need to use to "connect in," and bandwidth providers aren't remotely monopolized.

Not yet. But if the telecoms could charge other companies for access, what's to stop the telecoms from charging upstarts for access? The upstarts would need access in order to be able to give access.

You're crazy if you think that all of the recent mergers isn't the same as monopolization.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality

Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 19:08:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: Can you guarantee that it will have "very little" impact on most consumers? I doubt it.

No, I can't.

Quote:

<snip>

I don't know about you, but I most certainly cry foul in each and every one of those. When you pay for a service, you expect it to work. What right do the companies have to block sites, just because it has a conflict of interest? What right do the companies have to block emails, for the same reason?

Do business with an honest company? God forbid consumers have a bit of responsibility.

Quote: What happened to free speech (which I'll point out is protected by the First Amendment!)?

I would suggest reading the First Amendment at some point.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free

exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

ISPs are not congress.

Quote:Not yet. But if the telecoms could charge other companies for access, what's to stop the telecoms from charging upstarts for access? The upstarts would need access in order to be able to give access.

What stops them from doing that right now? Telecommunications is no longer a monopoly. Once telecoms have installed fiber to their final users, they will compete on an equal footing with the cable and satellite companies to provide video, data and telephone services. Most consumers will have access to at least these three alternatives. As in most competitive markets, we can expect vigorous price, product and service competition.

Edit: Regarding 'But if the telecoms could charge other companies for access?'

They already do. Bandwidth costs money.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 20:25:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

YSLMuffins wrote on Tue, 25 July 2006 13:53What free market? Isn't broadband service in many areas a monopoly?
It's not really the service, it's how they work the service. I believe one of the things that corporations are doing is making a second "tier" to the Internet which moves faster, people will pay to use this faster second "tier" for their servers/websites and leave the rest of the websites on the slower free one. I think that is how it works, at least.

Subject: Re: OT: Net Neutrality
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2006 21:01:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I pay to access the internet just as Yahoo or Microsoft pays their ISP for access. I can see how a tiered model might seemingly benefit consumers, but when the average person takes the internet for granted enough as it is, just how many knowledgeable consumers will there be to keep these telecommunications companies in check? The internet's getting old--we need to renovate it or growth will stagger! It's really so easy.

Not that I think Congress is as informed on the issue as I'd like. But there are a few good Congress representatives and senators.
