

Marketing assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



Net neutrality basically means that Internet service providers and governments should treat all data on the Internet equally. Treating the Internet equally means to not discriminate or charge differentially by user, content, site, platform, application, type of attached equipment, and modes of communication. Another accepted term for net neutrality is “open internet” where you can use your internet connection for anything you wish at no additional charge and with no restrictions-?? this would be a net neutral environment.

A “closed internet” is a situation where corporations can restrict what you see over an internet connection and charge for it. Regarding net neutrality in the United States, the FCC has laid out a series of rules and guidelines to follow. The four principles include accessing the lawful Internet content of their choice, running applications and use services of their choice, subject to the needs of law enforcement, connecting their choice of legal devices that do not harm the network, and competition among network providers, application and service providers, and content providers.

This is the current law for the United States. Although some are for net neutrality, there are many users against it. A big concern in regards to net neutrality is a concern for privacy. Users think that ISPs may have profit motives to analyze what their subscribers are viewing, and be able to use such information to their financial advantage. Innovation and Investment is another argument. Telecommunications providers such as telephone and cable companies, and some technology companies that supply networking gear, argue telecoms providers should have the ability to provide preferential treatment in the form of aired services.

A third argument is user welfare. Some opponents of net neutrality argue that under the ISP market competition, paid-pronunciation of bandwidth can induce optimal user welfare. Although net neutrality might protect user welfare when the market lacks competition, they argue that a better alternative could be to introduce a neutral public option to incentive competition; as oppose to enforcing existing Sips to be neutral. Another argument is counterweight to server-side non- neutrality.

Those in favor of forms of “ non-neutral” tiered Internet access argue that he Internet is not fair to users. Bandwidth ability is another argument. Users argue that net neutrality would prevent broadband networks from being built, which would limit available bandwidth and also endanger innovation. A last argument is opposition to legislation. Poor legislation could make it difficult for Internet service providers to legally perform necessary and generally useful packet filtering such as combating denial of service attacks and other aspects.

As far as arguments for net neutrality, one reason is control of data. Supporters of network neutrality want to signage cable companies as common carriers, which would require them to allow Internet service providers (Sips) free access to cable lines, the model used for dial-up Internet. Another argument is digital rights and freedom. Some users argue that net neutrality ensures that the Internet remains a free and open technology. Another argument is competition and innovation.

Proponents of net neutrality argue that allowing for preferential treatment of Internet traffic would put newer online companies at a disadvantage and

slow innovation in online services. Preservation Internet standards is another argument. Users for net neutrality have sponsored legislation claiming that authorizing incumbent network providers to override transport and application layer separation on the Internet would signal the decline of fundamental Internet standards and international consensus authority. Preventing pseudo-services is another argument for net neutrality.

Users argue that any violations to network neutrality will not involve genuine investment but rather payoffs for unnecessary and dubious services; they believe that it is unlikely that new investment will be made to lay special networks for particular websites to reach end- users faster. A last argument for net neutrality is end-to-end principle. Users in favor argue that network intelligence doesn't relieve end systems of the requirement to check inbound data for errors and to rate-limit the sender or for a wholesale removal of "intelligence" from the network core.

In my opinion, I am for net neutrality. I believe the government as well as Internet service providers should treat all Internet users equally. I do not think it is fair for a service provider to customize certain web pages to make it appeal to the user based off of the sites the user has visited. Even when I am using the Internet, I do not like when options on my sidebar or random ads pop up just because I visited a certain site that is similar to the ads that appear.

It also is a little bit eerie to me when I see ads that are similar to the sites I have seen. I should be able to visit whatever site I want to visit without having some pop up ad trying to steer me to a different site that is alike.

Although I am for net neutrality, I do understand the reasoning behind users who are against net neutrality. As far as intention and innovation, I understand that net neutrality would be considered an unfair business model.

I think it is a positive that businesses want to strive to the top and offer more components and options to buyers. But I think it is taking it too far when businesses get to the top by controlling out Internet, so to speak. Internet users should be able to view sites without having to worry about the Internet taking your information from search engines and using it to their advantage. I see both sides of the argument, but I believe there is more information to back up people who are for net neutrality. (1 , 002 words)