
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.
