Net Neutrality Literature Chronology

[Entries are listed most recent first. Key papers are marked by **]

Wikipedia Network Neutrality entry.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network_neutrality

“Network neutrality is a principle of internet regulation with particular relevance to the regulation of broadband internet access. It suggests that (1) to maximize human welfare, information networks ought be as neutral as possible between various uses or applications, and (2) if necessary, government ought to intervene to promote or preserve the neutrality of the network. Underlying the theory of the benefits of network neutrality is a belief that a neutral network promotes Schumpeterian, or evolutionary innovation of information technology.

Network neutrality arguments have antecedents in other concepts in communications law, such as "common carrier" regulation and the "Computer Inquiries" approach. The contemporary use of the phrase "network neutrality" began in the early 2000s, though its exact origins are unknown. Some groups prefer the term "bit discrimination."

Some of the arguments associated with network neutrality came into prominence in mid 2002, pushed by the "High Tech Broadband Coalition", a group comprised of developers for Amazon.com, Google, and Microsoft. Network neutrality arguments were also developed by legal academics, most prominently law professors Tim Wu and Lawrence Lessig as well as Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell.

Proposals for network neutrality laws are generally opposed by the cable television and telephone industries and conservative and libertarian scholars including Christopher Yoo and Adam Thierer. Opponents argue that (1) network neutrality "principles" are likely to become the basis for more intrusive regulation of the internet, and (2) imposing such regulation will chill investment in competitive networks (e.g., wireless broadband) and deny network providers the ability to differentiate their services.”

Websites


Forthcoming Book

Who Controls the Internet? : Illusions of a Borderless World
by Jack Goldsmith, Tim Wu Oxford University Press, USA (March 24, 2006)

Prepared by Rich Greenfield, IT Policy Manager, University of Alaska, January 30, 2006. Email: rich.greenfield@alaska.edu
Whose Line Is It Anyway? By Dan Frommer

“At a private meeting in the nation's capital on Jan. 25, representatives from some of the largest content and application providers, cable companies and telecom titans squared off to discuss the issue that has lately become a hot topic among political and tech wonks alike: network neutrality.

Network neutrality suggests that anyone using the Internet would have equal access to its pipes, which the big telecom companies -- who see a pot of gold at the end of this rainbow -- are doing their level best to veto. They want, effectively, uneven access for those willing to pay more.”

Hands Off Our Internet!

“Ed Whitacre, AT&T’s chairman and chief executive, warned on Monday that internet content providers that wanted to use broadband networks to deliver high-quality services such as movie downloads to their customers would have to pay for the service or face the prospect that new investment in high speed networks “will dry up.” “We have to figure out who pays for this bigger and bigger IP network,” said Mr Whitacre, who was in New York ahead of AT&T’s annual presentation to investors and analysts on Tuesday. “We have to show a return on our investments.” “I think the content providers should be paying for the use of the network – obviously not the piece from the customer to the network, which has already been paid for by the customer in Internet access fees – but for accessing the so-called Internet cloud.”

Net Firms Raise Capitol Hill Profile

“Unlike Google, Amazon has a political action committee, which contributed $32,000 last year to federal candidates, other PACs and political parties. Yahoo's PAC donated $98,500. By comparison, BellSouth Corp.'s PAC gave $726,725, according to PoliticalMoneyLine, which tracks political contributions, while AT&T Inc., product of the merger of AT&T Corp. and SBC Communications, gave $1.6 million.”

Prepared by Rich Greenfield, IT Policy Manager, University of Alaska, January 30, 2006. Email: rich.greenfield@alaska.edu
“You think the Internet will always be the great freewheeling information superhighway you've grown to love? Well, think again. Media giants want to privatize our Internet. Telecommunications companies like AT&T and Verizon are lobbying Congress for the right to control where you go on the Internet, how fast you get there, and how much you pay for the service.”

Verizon Pushes For Market Solution To 'Net Neutrality', Telecom PM Version, Technology Daily [by subscription only]
“...Tom Tauke, Verizon

01/25/06

We drank, talked of SIP, net neutrality, and big trucks. Posting by Russell Shaw. “Think of it this way I told him. On the Interstate, giant trucks pay more fees for carriage then do smaller trucks. That's because big trucks, over time, cause cracks in the highway that take money to fix.

Then he says, "but when Google sends video or voice over my BellSouth line, it isn't degrading my phone line."

Yes, well, it could," I answered. If bandwidth resources go down because some big bandwidth hogs are suckin' up most of the available pipe - well, have you ever had clogged pipes at home? You can say that the situation is likely to repair itself a few seconds later, and unlike that highway, won't take a road crew to fix. But for that second your speed is degrading, well that's a crack in your high-speed access highway right there.”


01/22/06

The Coming Tug of War Over the Internet By Christopher Stern Sunday, January 22, 2006; Page B01
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/01/21/AR2006012100094.html

01/19/06

CFA: Bells Will Block Packets January 19, 2006 Light Reading News Wire Feed
http://www.lightreading.com/document.asp?doc_id=87197 Consumer Federation of America survey: “Two-thirds of Internet users have serious concerns about practices by Internet network owners to block or impair their access to information and services, and the majority of those surveyed support congressional action to prevent this practice, according to a new poll released today by consumer and public interest groups .”

Survey Sparks QOS Fee Debate January 19, 2006 Light Reading News Wire Feed
http://www.lightreading.com/document.asp?doc_id=87193&WT.svl=news2_1 “To the question “Do you think RBOCs will degrade VOIP services that compete with their own VOIP and landline voice services?,” 64 replied “Yes” and 36 percent replied “No.” But our poll takers, so far at least, seem open to the QOS fee idea: 61 percent gave
it the thumbs up, while 39 percent objected to it. Only 31 percent of the poll takes believe
the FCC should take action against the practice. Most observers believe the commission
isn’t eager to get involved unless the telcos and Internet players can’t come to an
agreement on QOS fees among themselves. “

Internet's Universality Faces Threat - Endangered Domain: In Threat to Internet's Clout,
Some Are Starting Alternatives, Rise of Developing Nation; Anti-U.S. Views Play Role;
Pioneer Sounds the Alarm, A 'Root' Grows in Germany, by Christopher Rhoads ,Staff
http://online.wsj.com/search/date.html#SB113763907007950547

“German computer engineers are building an alternative to the Internet to make a
political statement. A Dutch company has built one to make money. China has created
three suffixes in Chinese characters substituting for .com and the like, resulting in Web
sites and email addresses inaccessible to users outside of China. The 22-nation Arab
League has begun a similar system using Arabic suffixes.”

01/17/06
Internet Freeloaders: Should Google have to pay for the bandwidth it consumes?
By Adam L. Penenberg Posted Tuesday, Jan. 17, 2006, at 5:10 PM ET
http://www.slate.com/id/2134397

Jeff Pulver to Eric Schmidt: Turn the Tide – Turn off BellSouth! “Given the market power
that Google has today, they are more relevant to the Internet community than BellSouth.
Given that, if I were running Google today, I would choose to implement a BellSouth
Boycott and stop offering access to Google to BellSouth customers and would start
advertising Cox Cable service on any requests that came from BellSouth customers in
their regions. I’m willing to wager that by Q3 2006, BellSouth’s DSL group will feel the
effects of their grave error in judgment.”
http://pulverblog.pulver.com/archives/003545.html

01/15/06
Hey, Baby BelLS: Information Still Wants to Be Free by Randall Stross, New York Times
http://www.gadsdentimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060115/ZNYT05/60115038
0/1011
http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F60D17F83C5B0C768DDDA80894DE4
04482 [requires fee]

“For one thing, the occasional need for a preferential fast lane for streaming video - that
is, moving pictures displayed as fast as they arrive, rather than downloaded first and
played from memory - exists in the United States only because our standard broadband
speeds are so slow. Were we ever to become a nation with networks supporting gigabit
service, streaming video would not require special handling.
Perhaps more important, the superabundance of content in the Internet's ecosystem is best
explained by its organizing principle of "network neutrality." The phrase refers to the
way the Internet welcomes everyone who wishes to post content. Consumers, in turn,
enjoy limitless choices. Rather than having network operators select content providers on
our behalf - the philosophy of the local cable company - the Internet allows all of us to
act as our own network programmers, serving a demographic of just one person.
Today, the network carrier has a minor, entirely neutral role in this system - providing the pipe for the bits that move the last miles to the home. It has no say about where those bits happened to have originated. Any proposed change in its role should be examined carefully, especially if the change entails expanding the carrier's power to pick and choose where bits come from - a power that has the potential to abrogate network neutrality.”

01/12/06

*QoS Fees Could Change Everything*, Light Reading

“The revelation that BellSouth Corp. (NYSE: BLS - message board) is looking to charge content providers – especially gaming companies and movie download sites – for a premium ride across its network is good news for several gear vendors. But, at the same time, the trend is causing a stir among standalone VOIP companies…BellSouth's plans, first reported last week in the Wall Street Journal, hits the topic of "net neutrality" – a belief that owners of broadband networks shouldn't discriminate against the kinds of applications and content sent across their network…The notion that service providers would charge extra for quality of service (QOS) challenges the idea of net neutrality, and could put third-parties using broadband connections for VOIP and other services demanding low-latency connection at a distinct disadvantage.” Poll results at: http://www.lightreading.com/survey_results.asp?doc_id=86706

01/10/06

*Ackerman addresses net neutrality, New Orleans*, by Ed Gubbins, Jan 10, 2006 1:01 PM
http://telephonyonline.com/finance/news/Ackerman_Citigroup_presentation_011006/

“BellSouth Chief Executive Officer Duane Ackerman shared his thoughts on a range of subjects—including video offerings, network neutrality and the status of its network in New Orleans—in an informal question-and-answer-style presentation at the Citigroup Entertainment, Media and Telecommunications Conference this morning.

The issue of network neutrality comprises two subjects, he said: access and network management. On the first subject, he said, “We don’t want to block anyone’s access to a Website or change their experience.”

On the subject of network management, which will become increasingly important as carriers such as BellSouth move deeper into the video market, telecom carriers will have to work with content providers as well as government agencies to establish workable solutions, he said. “There will ultimately need to be some commercial agreements established. Seldom can you deal with ubiquity without multiple revenue streams making that happen.”

*A Two-Tiered Internet in Our Future?* By Patrick Barnard, TMCnet

“It is expected that the House of Representatives will consider a bill proposing a second tier for the Internet early this year, when it once again takes up the issue of revamping the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The proposal is almost certain to result in outcry from the likes of Google, Yahoo, Time Warner Inc. and Microsoft, which fear that such a
move will give the big phone companies too much control over the flow of traffic across the Web.”

01/09/06

“The Internet companies, Common Cause and allies such as Public Knowledge and the Consumer Federation of America are pushing a net neutrality provision to be added to any new law, thus putting legal weight behind an FCC policy goal that has been around since February 2004.

Beyond concerns about freedom of information online, these companies argue that a provider-controlled Internet would slow innovation. Groundbreaking products and services often come from independent companies on the "edge" of the network, companies that may not have the resources to negotiate deals with huge broadband providers, they say.

A second vision for communications reform - advanced by large carriers Verizon and AT&T, as well as organizations such as the conservative think tank The Progress & Freedom Foundation - would remove most existing regulations and take away much of the FCC's rule-making powers. Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.) introduced a bill Dec. 15 that would overhaul the FCC's role.”

Qwest watches as others weigh fee for faster Internet services, By Jeff Smith, Rocky Mountain News
http://www.rockymountainnews.com/drmn/tech/article/0,2777,DRMN_23910_4373433,00.html

“Qwest Communications said it is watching with interest as some large telcos such as BellSouth Corp. are talking to Internet content providers about charging a fee to guarantee speedy, or priority, delivery of movies and other online products. The issue, reported by The Wall Street Journal on Friday, is becoming heated, with some arguing it will give telcos too much control over access to their high-speed networks.

BellSouth spokesman Jeff Battcher said Friday the idea isn't to control content or access."We're not going to stop anyone from going anywhere on the Web," Battcher said. "What happened is that most of these companies came to us, saying, 'We want to increase the experience for our customers.' They are willing to pay for faster downloads, quicker experiences so customers will stay with them."

He said BellSouth is in preliminary talks with content providers that include Movielink LLC, a Hollywood studio joint venture that rents and sells movies over the Internet. For Movielink, for example, BellSouth for a fee could "open" its broadband pipe, or network, to a faster speed of 6 megabits a second, Battcher said.

01/08/06
IOIC. International Open Internet Coalition. “For an Open Internet” A Letter to the Internet Community. David J. Farber, Peter G. Neumann, and Lauren Weinstein
http://www.ioic.net

,, The marvel that is the Internet is under an increasing barrage of policy, regulatory, and related technologically-enabled attacks against its fundamental open-access, "end-to-end"

Prepared by Rich Greenfield, IT Policy Manager, University of Alaska, January 30, 2006. Email: rich.greenfield@alaska.edu
operational model. Under the auspices of PFIR (People For Internet Responsibility), we have established a new organization -- the International Open Internet Coalition (IOIC) -- dedicated to the proposition that the Internet should remain an open and neutral resource, free from unreasonable interference or restrictions on the actions of businesses, organizations, individuals, or others related to their access or use of the Internet.”

*Future of open Internet in question?* Commentary: Network operators' demand for fees risky By Jeffry Bartash, MarketWatch “Big phone carriers would like to charge Internet companies for the right to reach their customers, but such a tactic is fraught with political risk and could invite a backlash.” [requires free registration]

**01/06/06**

Verizon Joins The Net Greed Chorus by David A. Utter,

“Yet another telecom CEO, this time Verizon's Ivan Seidenberg, sees the need for content providers like Google and Microsoft as well as consumers to pay for the network. Seidenberg said application providers need to "share the cost" of broadband, and cited how Verizon has been discussing the issue with Google already, a TechWeb report said. Unlike AT&T CEO Ed Whitacre and BellSouth CTO Willam Smith, both openly critical of companies like Google and VoIP service Vonage, Seidenberg went for the softer approach. He noted that those providers need a network to reach their customers.”


“Verizon Wireless said it was launching its long-awaited music-download service, teaming with Microsoft Corp. as it attempts to take on competing offerings from cellular rivals and Apple Computer Inc.'s popular iTunes service. The deal marks another move by telecom providers to move beyond traditional voice calling. Last year, Verizon Wireless's two biggest cellular competitors, Cingular Wireless and Sprint Nextel Corp., started selling services allowing consumers to download full-length songs onto their cellphones. Sprint subscribers can download songs wirelessly over its cellphone network. Cingular, jointly owned by AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corp., requires customers to connect a cord to a personal computer or a Mac. Verizon Wireless, a joint venture of New York-based Verizon Communications Inc. and Britain's Vodafone Group PLC, combines aspects of both features, and the company touted its new service, called V Cast Music, as a full-fledged competitor to the iTunes service from Apple.”

*Cisco Turns Traffic Cop* by Scott Moritz

“Under the heading of security and quality assurance, network operators have already installed equipment that can identify and prioritize traffic. This gear helps speed along bits of conversation that are obviously time-sensitive, as well as isolate viruses and intruders looking to cripple networks.

The success of this Internet gear has helped support Net calling upstarts like Skype, a unit of eBay, and Vonage. The rise of these so-called voice over Internet protocol shops has in
turn taken a big bite out of the core calling business of titans like AT&T (T:NYSE) and Verizon (VZ:NYSE),

The increased competition, while offering more choices and lower prices for consumers, has dramatically quickened the pace of revenue erosion in telecom. So big telcos see little upside as so-called dumb-pipe operators forced to transport new digital services like video calls and TV-on-demand chip away at their businesses.

To fight back, the telcos are buying network-control technologies that allow tiered service for premium applications like video and interactive gaming. Using tech like deep packet inspection, the telcos can identify the source, destination and type of traffic on the network. Using that info, the telco can sell guaranteed service quality or priority delivery to make sure the event goes off without a hitch.

On the flip side, of course, the new tools allow the network operators to discriminate against would-be rivals if they choose.”

Phone Companies Set Off A Battle Over Internet Fees - Content Providers May Face Charges for Fast Access; Billing the Consumer Twice? By Dionne Searcey And Amy Schatz, Wall Street Journal, Page A1
http://online.wsj.com/search/date.html#SB113651664929039412

“Large phone companies, setting the stage for a big battle ahead, hope to start charging Google Inc., Vonage Holdings Corp. and other Internet content providers for high-quality delivery of music, movies and the like over their telecommunications networks. BellSouth Corp. said it is in early talks with Internet movie companies and at least one gaming company with the aim of striking agreements on fees to guarantee fast content delivery over the Internet. Movielink LLC, a joint-venture of five major movie studios that offers movies to consumers over the Internet, said it has discussed the issue with BellSouth. Meanwhile, AT&T Corp. executives have expressed support for charging companies to ensure that their content gets priority delivery, and Verizon Communications Inc. Chief Executive Ivan Seidenberg yesterday said he might favor reaching deals with companies to do the same. "We have to make sure they don't sit on our network and chew up our capacity," Mr. Seidenberg told reporters. The phone companies envision a system whereby Internet companies would agree to pay a fee for their content to receive priority treatment as it moves across increasingly crowded networks. Those that don't pay the fee would find their transactions with Internet users -- for games, movies and software downloads, for example -- moving across networks at the normal but comparatively slower pace. Consumers could benefit through faster access to content from companies that agree to pay the fees.”

01/05/06
Verizon Says Google, Microsoft Should Pay For Internet Apps By Paul Kapustka, TechWeb News
http://www.techweb.com/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=175801739

“According to Seidenberg, Verizon and Google are already talking about how such compensation might be structured, striking a tone far more diplomatic than AT&T CEO
Ed Whitacre, who last year openly criticized Internet application providers like Google and Voice over IP provider Vonage Holdings. "We talk to them [Google] all the time, and they understand the issue," said Seidenberg, in a question-and-answer period following his keynote speech Thursday at the Consumer Electronics show here. Google, which already offers a bevy of online apps like email, instant messaging, voice and satellite map searches, is expected to announce a video-download service here Friday. (Google could not be reached for comment immediately.) While Seidenberg said Verizon "intuitively" believes that the Internet should be open to all applications, he also said that "we need to make sure there is the right economic model," especially in regards to so-called "free" or advertising-supported applications, which generally do not offer any direct compensation to the network service provider. "We have to make sure that they [application providers] don't sit on our network and chew up bandwidth," Seidenberg said. "We need to pay for the pipe."

**01/20/06**

*The Importance Of The Internet And Public Support For Network Neutrality: National Survey Results by Mark Cooper, Director of Research Consumer Federation of America and Ben Scott, Policy Director Free Press*


“Almost three quarters (72 percent) agree that cable and telephone companies should adhere to the principle of operating their networks in a neutral manner. ! Less than half (47 percent) believe that these companies will voluntarily refrain from blocking or impairing services and applications.”

**12/21/05**

*Playing favorites on the Net?*By Anne Broache and Declan McCullagh

“Broadband providers and e-commerce companies, historic allies on many political fronts, are finding themselves butting heads over federal legislation that could change the way either side does business.

A bill expected early next year in the U.S. House of Representatives, coupled with recent comments made by executives from BellSouth and the newly merged AT&T and SBC Communications, has raised the prospect of a two-tiered Internet in which some services-especially video--would be favored over others. “

**12/20/05**

*Broadband Firms Fight For Premium Treatment* By David Hatch, National Journal’s Insider Update: The Telecom Act


“AT&T, BellSouth and Verizon Communications are fiercely lobbying to retain language in a pending House telecommunications bill that would permit them to offer premium tiers of high-speed Internet service favoring their content. The draft bill [Barton’s BITS bill], floated recently by Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, contains "network neutrality" provisions intended to prohibit telecom and cable companies from blocking or impeding competitors on their high-speed networks. But the
draft makes an exception for companies to offer multiple tiers, resulting in potentially faster transmission rates for them and slower speeds for competitors. Comcast, Time Warner and other major cable providers oppose all mandatory neutrality restrictions but abide by voluntary guidelines. "Network neutrality is a solution in search of a problem," said Brian Dietz, spokesman for the National Cable and Telecommunications Association. “Barton’s Staff Discussion Draft of Broadband Legislation

How Telecoms Will Kill The Internet by David A. Utter. “webpronews.com 2005-12-20 “Net neutrality is coming to an end, as an array of deep-pocketed telecom firms throw money and lobbyists at Congress in an unyielding effort to put a barely-figurative chokehold on Internet users.” http://www.webpronews.com/topnews/topnews/wpn-60-20051220HowTelecomsWillKillTheInternet.html

12/19/05
The Search for Net Neutrality by Michael Geist, Canada Research Chair in Internet & E-commerce Law, University of Ottawa, Faculty of Law, e-mail: mgeist@uottawa.ca, phone: 562-5800 x3319 Appeared in the Toronto Star on December 19, 2005 as Dangers in ISPs' Bid For New Tolls
http://www.michaelgeist.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1040

12/15/05
At Stake: The Net as We Know It., News Analysis by Catherine Yang
“Google et al fear broadband carriers will tie up traffic with new tolls and controls. Ultimately, it could mean a world of Internet haves and have-nots.”
http://www.businessweek.com/technology/content/dec2005/tc20051215_141991.htm

12/14/05
"I'm hesitant to adopt rules that would prevent anti-competitive behavior where there hasn't been significant evidence of a problem," Martin said at a conference luncheon by Comptel, a group representing competitive telephone carriers.”

12/13/05
http://www.webprowire.com/summaries/1200382.html

Fight brewing in Congress on control of the Net. Phone, cable giants want to give some providers preferential treatment — for a fee By Marilyn Geewax WASHINGTON BUREAU http://www.statesman.com/business/content/business/stories/12/13net.html

12/12/05
good versus private benefit. That's what regulation is for. In this case, competition will not replace regulation. We don't need any old Network Neutrality rule. We need a network neutrality rule that is (a) clear, (b) strongly enforceable, and (c) incents physical network development. Anything less is bound to fail.”


12/09/05
Video Franchising, 'Net Neutrality' Shape Hearing On Telecom Reform

12/07/05
Barton Remains Determined To Move Telecom Overhaul Bill Next Week. National Journal Insider Update: The Telecom Act  By Drew Clark (Wednesday, December 7) http://njtelecomupdate.com/lenya/telco/live/tb-MLES1133909206739.html“On Tuesday, a Markey aide said committee staffers had drafted a third version of the legislation, one which considerably reworked provisions dealing with "network neutrality". The latter, which has emerged as a key issue in the telecommunications debate, involves requirements that telecommunications and cable companies not impede data flowing over the Internet. Asked about that issue, Barton said, "It is in the eyes of the beholder," adding that it was but one of a handful of telecom issues under discussion by the legislators. “

12/02/05
Consumer advocates push for network neutrality Principle would ensure Internet users had the freedom to access content of their choice, attach devices of their choice, and run applications of their choice  By Grant Gross, IDG News Service, InfoWorld, December 02, 2005 http://www.infoworld.com/article/05/12/02/HNnetworkneutrality_1.html

Broadband 'Net Neutrality' in Question , Free speech, high finance at issue
By Jen Anderson, Steve Rhodes and Josh Wilson http://www.artsandmedia.net/cgi-bin/dc/newsdesk/2003/12/02_net_neutrality

12/01/05

11/29/05
Network Neutrality -- Desirable But Not Practical by David S. Isenberg. Isen.blog “There's a consensus emerging among my friends Brough Turner, Bill St. Arnaud and Martin Geddes, that Network Neutrality by regulation is not practical. Each has their own reasons, but the conclusions converge inescapably with mine -- given current industry structure, the incentives are all wrong. Vint Cerf's fervent wish (hey, mine too, were it more plausible!) for a "lightweight, enforceable Network Neutrality rule" is a pipe dream.
Any such rule I could think up would put today's carriers in an untenable, self-competitive situation.” [see later post of 12/12/05]:

11/28/05
[CAnet - news] The future of the net - restrictive monopolies or network neutrality?
Bill St.Arnaud bill.st.arnaud at canarie.ca Mon Nov 28 11:38:04 EST 2005

11/26/05

11/25/05
Skype Journal: Would the real Network Neutrality please stand up?

11/21/05
Google and Net Neutrality by Bret Swanson

11/16/05
Saving the Net: How to Keep the Carriers from Flushing the Net Down the Tubes
By Doc Searls on Wed, 2005-11-16 02:00. Linux Journal
http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/8673

Saving the Net: Idealism vs. Practicality. By David S. Isenberg, isen.blog

That 1999 Show: Return of the 'Open Access' Wars by Holman W. Jenkins, Jr.
November 16, 2005; Page A19, Wall Street Journal Online

** 11/09/05
House Hearing: Staff discussion [Barton] draft of legislation to create a statutory framework for Internet Protocol and Broadband Services. Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, November 9, 2005. 2123 Rayburn House Office Building. 10:00 AM

11/08/05
Vint Cerf speaks out on net neutrality, 11/08/2005 01:21:00 PM, Posted by Alan Davidson, Washington Policy Counsel, DC office

Prepared by Rich Greenfield, IT Policy Manager, University of Alaska, January 30, 2006. Email: rich.greenfield@alaska.edu
At SBC, It's All About "Scale and Scope"  
CEO Edward Whitacre talks about the AT&T Wireless acquisition and how he's moving to keep abreast of cable competitors: “How concerned are you about Internet upstarts like Google (GOOG), MSN, Vonage, and others? How do you think they're going to get to customers? Through a broadband pipe. Cable companies have them. We have them. Now what they would like to do is use my pipes free, but I ain't going to let them do that because we have spent this capital and we have to have a return on it. So there's going to have to be some mechanism for these people who use these pipes to pay for the portion they're using. Why should they be allowed to use my pipes?

The Internet can't be free in that sense, because we and the cable companies have made an investment and for a Google or Yahoo! or Vonage or anybody to expect to use these pipes [for] free is nuts! “ BusinessWeek Online November 7, 2005
http://www.businessweek.com/@@n34h*IUQu7KtOwgA/magazine/content/05_45/b3958092.htm

A Silver Lining to Net Neutrality Merger Conditions? PFF Blog November 3, 2005

FCC & Net Neutrality: Do they actually intend to enforce it?  
Posted on 2005-11-01 10:22:05 Written by Karl Bode
http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/69058

Moore’s Lore: November 01, 2005  Net Neutrality Will Triumph
Posted by Dana Blankenhorn

Net Neutrality and Competition, Monday October 31, 2005 by Ed Felten
http://www.freedom-to-tinker.com/?p=918

Phone, Cable Firms Rein In Consumers’ Internet Use: Big Operators See Threat to Service as Web Calls, Videos Clog Up Networks, by Peter Grant and Jesse Drucker, Wall Street Journal Online [may require fee]
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB112985651806475197.html

** 09/29/05  
9/23/05
No 'Net Neutrality' Laws Needed, Panel Says. Government intervention to keep the Internet "open" could do more harm than good, according to a panel of experts speaking at an industry forum this week. By Lawrence Binda, Advanced IP Pipeline Information Week, Sept. 23, 2005
http://www.informationweek.com/story/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=171200219

** 9/20/05
Entire 46 page paper in PDF is at:

9/14/2005
Network neutrality. Posted by Brett Frischmann @ 1:55 pm

9/13/05
The difficult bargain of net neutrality by Susan Crawford at 10:09PM (EDT) on September 13, 2005

8/29/05
The fairy tale of 'net neutrality' By Kevin Tolly, Network World, 08/29/05

8/12/05
Net neutrality. Eszter’s Blog Entry
http://campuscgi.princeton.edu/~eszter/weblog/archives/00000397.html

8/09/05
FCC: 'Net Neutrality' For All
August 9, 2005

08/08/05
Boucher Calls for Codification of Network Neutrality Principles.
http://www.house.gov/boucher/docs/netneutrality.htm

8/05/05

Prepared by Rich Greenfield, IT Policy Manager, University of Alaska, January 30, 2006. Email: rich.greenfield@alaska.edu
FCC Adopts Policy Statement. New Principles Preserve and Promote the Open and Interconnected Nature of Public Internet


Also, see Net Neutrality resource page of CyberTelecom at
http://www.cybertelecom.org/ci/neutral.htm

07/07/05
Openness Post-Brand X: It begins . . .

07/06/05
** Principles for an Open Broadband Future. (Also available in DOC and PDF formats.)

A Public Knowledge White Paper “Broadband networks must be

1. open to competition from any entity, including municipalities;
2. open to the attachment of any equipment the user chooses, as long as it does not harm the technical operation of the broadband network;
3. open and accessible to consumers, application developers, and information service providers and to other networks, without restrictions or degradation, except for law enforcement or for network management purposes;
4. open, available and affordable to all consumers, regardless of income, race, geographic location, or disability; and
5. open to the maximally efficient number of licensed and unlicensed wireless providers.”

http://www.publicknowledge.org/content/papers/open-broadband-future

06/02/05
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB11176638843848621.html

05/23/05

5/12/05
Consumer advocates push for network neutrality by Grant Gross, IDG News Service

04/23/05

02/14/05
Net ' Freedoms' May Be Powell's Legacy  By Paul Kapustka
http://www.networkingpipeline.com/60400414
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** The Economics of Net Neutrality: Why the Physical Layer of the Internet Should Not Be Regulated. By Christopher S. Yoo. 44 pages

7/27/04
Perspective: Net neutrality: Now, more than ever By Lawrence Spiwak
Published: July 27, 2004, 4:00 AM PDT

06/___/04
NCTA (National Cable and Telecommunications Association). Cable Provides Open Connectivity for the Internet. 2 pages

02/08/04
Michael K. Powell, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, At the Silicon Flatirons Symposium on “The Digital Broadband Migration: Toward a Regulatory Regime for the Internet Age” University of Colorado School of Law Boulder, Colorado. February 8, 2004 (As prepared for delivery). Preserving Internet Freedom: Guiding Principles For The Industry 6 pages

01/12/04
Reviewed in Tech Law Journal

_?_/__?_/2004
“…network neutrality raises the even more significant danger of forestalling the emergence of new broadband technologies by reinforcing the existing supply-side and demand-side economies of scale and by stifling incentives to invest in alternative network platforms.”

10/10/03
C Michael Copps: "The Beginning Of The End Of The Internet? Discrimination, Closed Networks, And The Future Of Cyberspace" 10 pages
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09/23/03
Broadband Principles for Consumer Connectivity,” High Tech Broadband Coalition,

8/22/03
** Net Neutrality: FCC Ex Parte by Tim Wu and Lawrence Lessig. 17 page PDF
http://faculty.virginia.edu/timwu/wu_lessig_fcc.pdf

06/27/2003
"Net Neutrality: Let's Look Before We Leap" Remarks of Assistant Secretary of
Commerce Nancy J. Victory to the Progress and Freedom Foundation Conference

03/31/03
Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators. Notice of Ex Parte Presentation
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=651378
4014

11/18/02
Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators. Broadband Group Urges FCC to Ensure
Consumer Freedom on the Internet
http://www.itaa.org/isec/docs/itaa111802cbui.pdf
http://www.itaa.org/isec/docs/itaa111802cbui.pdf

Tech Companies Ask for Unfiltered Net By Declan McCullagh.

03/14/02
FCC's Decision on Cable Broadband Services Broadens Cable Industry's Media
Monopoly

08/18/00
Cable Net Users Feel Squeezed  by Chris Oakes
Story location: http://www.wired.com/news/technology/0,1282,38227,00.html
03:00 AM Aug. 18, 2000 PT
http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,38227,00.html

It’s the Architecture, Mr. Chairman by Lawrence Lessig. Explains “end-to-end” design
principle. [Undated]
http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/works/lessig/cable/Cable.html
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