Support for Net Neutrality

“The absence of Net Neutrality will result in a situation in which the disadvantaged will feel like pariahs and outcasts in the Internet world as they are not rich or influential enough to afford the not-so-free Internet anymore.”

June Sato’s *Net Neutrality: And Why It Should Matter to Everyone*, is a basic and broad introduction to the topic of Net Neutrality. Sato’s purpose for writing this book is to inform readers about net neutrality and what will happen if the Federal Communications Commission abolishes net neutrality. Net Neutrality is a complex topic and Sato is hoping to clarify it for readers to understand what Net Neutrality means and the ethics that are associated with it. Sato strongly advocates for net neutrality and believes that it is fundamental to have net neutrality in order to allow marginalized communities to voice their opinions. The purpose of this review
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* Location number will be used instead of page number for citations due to digital book format.
2 Id. at 61 (finding that without Net Neutrality minorities will have difficulty expressing their opinions).
primarily focuses on criticizing the author’s arguments for Net Neutrality and lack of detail to arguments against Net Neutrality.

June Sato is an entrepreneur from Los Angeles, California. As a child, June was fascinated with computers and the internet, which led him to become aware of great opportunities for financial growth online at a young age. With the rising trends of online businesses and cryptocurrency, she left university to become a digital entrepreneur. Sato has published a few other books including: *Altcoins Mastery: Getting a Head Start on the Next Great Cryptocurrency for 2018 and Beyond*, *Ripple Cryptocurrency Report: How XRP is Changing the World of Financial Transactions and Why You Should Invest Now*, and *Litecoin Millionaire: Mastering the Basics of Mining, Investing and Trading Litecoin Cryptocurrency*.

The purpose of this book, *Net Neutrality: And Why It Should Matter to Everyone*, is to inform readers about the talks and discussions on Net Neutrality. Net Neutrality is a complex topic and Sato is hoping to clarify it for readers to understand what Net Neutrality means why it would be terrible for the Federal Communications Commission to abolish Net Neutrality. Sato’s book is a biased one-sided view of Net Neutrality. As such, it covers many topics pertaining to Net Neutrality, but only goes into small detail. Due to the minimal number of pages that this book has, 44, it can be viewed that Sato either had very little to discuss in great detail about the
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3 See *Net Neutrality: And Why It Should Matter to Everyone*, AMAZON (Apr. 12, 2018), archived at https://perma.cc/78HJ-SSXU (setting forth the authors place of origin).
4 Id. (discussing the authors early rise to entrepreneurship)
5 Id. (noting the career path that Sato took, which included dropping out of college).
7 See JUNE SATO, *RIPPLE CRYPTOCURRENCY REPORT: HOW XRP IS CHANGING THE WORLD OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS AND WHY YOU SHOULD INVEST NOW* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2018) (arguing that Ripple has such a bright future, and why investing in the right project could pay dividends).
topics pertaining to Net Neutrality or lacks the necessary knowledge to divulge into greater analysis.

The first chapter of the book spans from location 38 to 140. The chapter briefly goes into detail about understanding Net Neutrality. Sato goes on to say Net Neutrality “is the Internet’s guiding principle that aims to keep out lobbyists and greedy capitalists so that every human is being allowed to access the content he chooses without being unduly discriminated against.” An objectively viewed reader would undoubtedly determine the significant bias that has been implemented while only two paragraphs into the book. However, Sato does an excellent job analogizing the definition of Net Neutrality by comparing it to the concept of toll roads.10 Sato explains that there are multiple toll roads within the United States with multiple companies managing them.11 As a consumer one would not care which company is managing the toll roads because they would not feel discriminated against when they drive through the toll roads since it does not matter who is managing that particular toll road.12 Sato then turns his focus on the concept of free internet and uses Comcast, Verizon, AT&T, as examples of large companies who would subjectively discriminate by the throttling of data to consumers.13 A law student and a practicing attorney would easily understand the concept of discrimination, but Sato doesn’t explain that by discriminating against a specific class such as race, gender, religion, etc., would violate the law. Sato merely explains hardships that the affected class of users would entail, which is important, but he fails to discuss the legal implications.

9 See Sato, supra note 1 at 43 (arguing that the Net Neutrality protects the consumers from capitalists).
10 See Sato, supra note 1 at 43 (comparing Net Neutrality to the concept of toll roads to make it easier for the reader to comprehend).
11 See Sato, supra note 1 at 43 (finding that with multiple tolls roads there are also multiple companies, which allows us not to be discriminated against when charging toll fees).
12 See Sato, supra note 1 at 43 (highlighting that not being discriminated against would be the result of companies not being able to control who has access to the internet).
13 See Sato, supra note 1 at 48 (noting the author’s view in regard to large companies who would discriminate against their users).
Sato turns his attention into how Internet service providers would be able to openly discriminate against the low-income individuals because they would not be able to afford the more expensive data plans that would allow users to access the internet at faster speeds.\textsuperscript{14} Sato remarkably isn’t aware that this discrimination in flow of data already exists with the current implementation of Net Neutrality. Users presently have the option to obtain access to higher data speeds at an increased cost. Sato argues that the abolishing of Net Neutrality will create increased costs to the user as well as restrict specific content by limiting access and or throttling data speeds to the content. While this is a mere hypothesis, it is certainly possible that there could be alternative solutions to the increased costs to the consumer such as more advertisements, which would offset the costs to the consumer.

The contract formed between the Internet service provider and the consumer would outline what content the users would be able to access and at what speeds the user would be able to stream high-bandwidth data. Law students and lawyers would clearly recognize that the underlining of this contract is not entirely different from the current contracts between Internet service providers and users. It would explicitly outline what is included and a what price. Sato fails to raise this point because it is unsupportive to his biased argument. Sato merely explains that Internet service providers would intentionally throttle data speeds to lower paying customers, but that currently exists with the Net Neutrality rules.

Sato argues that one of the negative implications of Net Neutrality is that it makes it difficult for Internet service providers to profit from high bandwidth users because a user’s rates do not rise as their data usage increases.\textsuperscript{15} These internet service providers already charge an

\textsuperscript{14}See Sato, \textit{supra} note 1 at 119-123 (noting that without Net Neutrality low-income individuals would not be able to view content of their choice at an affordable price).

\textsuperscript{15}See Sato, \textit{supra} note 1 at 307 (stating an opinion that because users are not capped with Net Neutrality, it is a negative trait since extreme bandwidth users are not subjected to higher fees).
exorbitant rate for their services. Even if a customer uses their internet only for simple email correspondence, they still pay a very high fee. More often than not these users only have one option for an Internet service provider due to monopolization. Sato’s argument fails in many respects as these Internet service providers will only gain by the abolishment of Net Neutrality.

June Sato’s *Net Neutrality: And Why It Should Matter to Everyone* is not a suitable book to inform law student’s and attorneys of the ongoing legal issues that deal with Net Neutrality. Sato lacks the comprehensive detail in analyzing legal issues when discussing her support for Net Neutrality. The book although a quick read, and informative on an introductory level, however, being such a biased book, I found it difficult to be convincing on why Sato believes Net Neutrality should not be abolished. My personal beliefs, aside from anything I learned from this book, is for Net Neutrality to stay if effect. Sato fails to convince me from his arguments on why the Federal Communications Commission should be prevented from abolishing Net Neutrality. This book would be excellent for those who have no basic knowledge of what Net Neutrality is as well as for those who want to know the general framework on how repealing Net Neutrality would affect the internet for all consumers.