

An analogy to the transportation industry may be appropriate, although I do not pretend that this is a perfect analogy. If you need to go from point A to point B, you can take a direct flight via commercial aircraft - it's fast, it's relatively safe, and it's expensive! Or, you can take the bus. It's slow, it's less comfortable, and it makes frequent stops and detours into small towns along the way, but eventually it WILL get you there, and for far less money. You do not see people avoiding the airlines simply because buses are cheaper - they each cater to a different class of people. I would daresay that many of the folks who use Internet telephone products are folks who simply want to hold casual conversations with others, or use an Internet telephone product as a quicker substitute for e-mail. At this point in time, the quality of connections would make them totally inappropriate for most business-related communications. I expect this will change as quality improves, but the ACTA companies should have ample time to react to any such changes long before there is any serious impact on their profit margins due to the use of Internet telephony.

You might want to gather some actual usage statistics before deciding that there is a problem. You could start, for example, by surveying your staff at the F.C.C. You might ask whether ANYONE there is receiving voice calls via the Internet, and if so, whether the percentage of calls that are received via the Internet (as compared to those received via the public telephone network) is any significant percentage. My expectation would be that this figure would be zero for the vast majority of your staff, and only a very small percentage for anyone that actually is current using an Internet telephony product. The fact is that the vast majority of people have no idea how to use an Internet telephony product (even if they are aware that such products exist), and there are VERY few businesses that can be contacted using such a product. In my opinion, any loss that ACTA members may be suffering from Internet telephony applications is about the equivalent of a child occasionally taking a scoop of sand home from the beach along the ocean. ACTA would of course claim that usage will increase in time, and they may be correct, but that only means that they will need to observe any increase in usage of such products and make business decisions accordingly.

Although Internet telephony may be unknown or insignificant to the vast majority of people, there is one class of users for which it may be very significant - I am referring to those users who may find it difficult or impossible to operate a conventional keyboard. For some these people, voice may be the only way they can effectively and efficiently use the Internet. If a person has a visual impairment, or cannot type (or can type only with great difficulty), voice may be a much more efficient medium than e-mail or text-based "chat" functions. I think it is even possible that any ban on voice via the Internet might be at odds with the goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Another point that I would like to make is that the Internet is in many ways essentially a private network, and there is questionable legal justification for regulation of the Internet. I am not saying that the F.C.C. is totally unable to exercise regulation, but I would ask you to consider carefully whether you are interjecting government intervention in a lawful manner. For the most part, the Internet does not use the public airwaves (which have been considered a scarce public resource, and therefore under F.C.C. jurisdiction), nor is it a regulated monopoly (another possible justification for government regulation). Although the Internet began as a publicly funded entity, for the most part that is no longer the case. So I would request that you not attempt to engage in excessive regulation of what is essentially a network that, during the most explosive part of its growth, has flourished under a free-market system with little government interference.

In my opinion, this free-market model ought to be encouraged and expanded. It is my understanding that one of the chief complaints of ACTA is that their members are required by the government to pay access charges to local telephone companies when they use that facilities of local phone companies to originate or complete a long distance call. In my opinion, these government-mandated access fees ought to be eliminated entirely, or at least restructured to be a percentage of moneys actually collected from customers (by the carriers), and NOT based on the current "minutes of use" model (and in my opinion, total elimination of these charges is the BEST way to resolve the problem)

I feel that these access charges are not appropriate for several reasons. For one thing, under the new Telecommunications Act, local phone companies are now permitted to enter the long distance market and complete calls outside of their own service area. Presumably they will not be levying access charges on calls they carry themselves (and even if they do, it will simply be a movement of money on paper, from their left pocket to their right pocket, so to speak). Therefore, the imposition of access charges on other carriers gives the local phone companies an unfair advantage in the new competitive marketplace.

The other major reason I dislike access charges is that it limits the options for consumers. If the F.C.C. feels that

access charges are appropriate, I contend that they should be based on a percentage of monies actually collected. No long distance carrier can afford to operate at a loss, so there would always be some revenue flowing to local phone companies, but at the same time changing the method of levying access charges would allow long distance carriers to experiment with pricing options that are impossible under today's model. For example, some carriers would almost certainly offer flat-rate calling (pay a fixed monthly fee and get unlimited calling, perhaps during non-peak hours only). So either elimination or restructuring of the current access charges could have tremendous positive effects for consumers. However, as my mother used to say, "two wrongs do not make a right", and it is not right to try and ban voice over the Internet simply because ACTA members have a quite legitimate complaint about access charges.

I truly believe that if access fees were collected as a percentage of monies collected (by the long distance carrier) rather than bases on minutes-of-use, the local telephone companies would come out ahead, because a lot of people who avoid making long distance calls now would sign up for a \$20 per month "unlimited" calling plan (even one that excludes business hours) if the carriers could offer it. That would give the phone companies an access charge they would not otherwise get. While there are some people who spend much more than that in a month in long distance charges, there are also a lot of people (even in this day and age) that try to avoid making toll calls whenever possible. In my opinion, the dimwit dad on the AT&T television commercial that wanders around his home and yard watching his kids run up expensive phone bills is definitely the exception rather than the rule!

I would also note that Internet Service Providers would have many more options today in making connections (with both end users and the Internet backbone) if local telephone service had not been a regulated monopoly for so many years. Local phone companies sometimes act as though they have some sort of right to government and other subsidies, when in fact for many decades they have had the best possible subsidy - a monopoly on the provision local telephone service - and they benefit from this even today because they have an established infrastructure of wires and cables that no competitor can hope to duplicate for many years into the future. Yet even with this huge advantage going into the new competitive marketplace, they still want continued subsidies (access fees). In my opinion, these are simply no longer appropriate, if they ever were.

I would note that this point that any assertion that Internet Service Providers do not pay access charges is simply wrong... if they use the telephone lines to connect with end users, then they pay access charges on each and every phone line. In fact, on any given Internet connection, there may be as many as four or more telephone lines involved, and on each such line, at the very least the federally-mandated monthly access charge is being collected. Let's take for the moment the example of an end user of Internet services using an Internet telephony product to connect to another end user of such a product elsewhere in the United States. Each end user has to pay a monthly federally-mandated access charge for the line they are using, so that is two lines on which access charges are being paid. In addition, each user is connecting to one modem out of a modem pool owned by their respective Internet Service Providers, so that is two more lines on which access charges are being paid. Further, it is possible that there are other access charges being paid - for example, if either user is making a toll call to reach their Internet Service Provider, access charges are being paid on the toll call.

Note, also, that there is no requirement that any part of this connection travel via telephone company facilities, and therefore any charge or policy that assumes that the public switched telephone network is being used for all or part of any given Internet connection is inappropriate.

For example, suppose you have a connection that is entirely within one city (two branch offices of the same company, for example, or perhaps two teenagers that attend the same school) and both users are communicating with their Internet Service Provider (ISP) via cable modems? And let's further assume that the ISP connects to the Internet backbone via co-location at an MCI or Sprint Point of Presence, or perhaps uses a direct private microwave link to make that connection. In such a case, there could quite possibly be no connection at all with the local Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN). While this situation is somewhat uncommon today, it could easily become more common, particularly if the

F.C.C. mandates higher access fees on connections that utilize the PSTN.

One argument for the elimination of "access charges" to ACTA members, or for not applying them to Internet Service Providers, is that they in effect allow the phone companies to charge for a service that they are not providing. With a conventional long distance voice call, if the carrier has a Point Of Presence in the same local community where the call originates, then the phone company is in fact only responsible for completing a local link from the originator's phone to the carrier's switch. This is really no different from any other local call, except for the necessity to collect data for billing (and if the phone company does this, they charge the long distance carrier for that service anyway). If the phone company is not collecting billing information (as in a modem call to an ISP), they are providing NO service

at all other than extending a local call.

The Internet Service Provider buys standard business grade lines and receives phone calls on them, in a manner no different from that of a private "Bulletin Board System" (BBS) operator, or a private modem-to-modem connection between two end users. The line connects to a modem in all of those cases. The fact that some modems are connected to an Internet Service Provider's equipment, while some are connected to a BBS that may still be part of a network of BBS's, such as Fidonet, and others to a standalone BBS (and still others to someone's personal computer) should not really be any of the phone company's concern. When we put a modem on a phone line, should we really have to declare whether someone might send anything over it that might eventually wind up on the Internet?

The difference between these services are not as apparent as one might at first think. For example, if I dial up my Internet Service Provider, I could connect to a BBS that they operate at the local POP, and never send any traffic outside my local calling area. By the same token, I could dial up a Fidonet BBS and leave an e-mail message that would go out onto the Internet. So it will be very difficult to determine which regulations apply to which services, and ultimately would put the government in the position of having to enforce more regulations, and many of them in a somewhat arbitrary manner. This is not a situation that will be welcomed by telephone customers, and probably not by very many people at all outside a very limited subset of people who are trying to protect their own financial interests.

So, in my opinion, the appropriate way to deal with ACTA's complaints about the use of the Internet for voice is to restructure, or better yet, eliminate the access charges paid by ACTA members (and ultimately by telephone customers). Any attempt to ban a particular type of computer software, on the other hand, would be an unprecedented move by the F.C.C. and in my opinion would be doomed to failure for all the reasons I have presented above.

Thank you for reading these comments, and I hope that you will take them into consideration as you are making your decision on this case.

Jack Decker
Twin Lake, Michigan
E-mail: jack@novagate.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 6 1996

From: Jerry Kuchera <minos@rust.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/3/96 12:12pm
Subject: Informal Coments re: ACTA petition Rulemaking No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Hundt,

I ask the FCC to deny the ACTA petition on the grounds the petition will limit competition and innovation, denying the common citizen another choice of how to conduct his or her affairs.

I wish to encourage the FCC to allow the use of internet telecommunications. History has shown the country that can deliver goods and services the quickest, most efficiently and at reasonable cost will prosper: The current Interstate Highways are a good example of my point. Because of the interstate highway system, goods arrive at destinations faster, fresher, and at excellent cost. Whole industries have sprung up because of it. Indeed, the railroads have become more competitive, due to superhighways.

With regards to the internet telecommunication software, government can continue to encourage companies to innovate and produce a useful service with low carrying costs. This is the kind of technology that helps make the United States the great country it is!

Please deny this outrageous petition-it does nothing but protect entrenched interests and limits continued expansion of technology and enterprize.

Sincerely,

Jerry Kuchera
Oxford, MI minos@rust.net

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ACCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: <LOEB.JEFFREY_L@san-diego.va.gov>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/3/96 5:49pm
Subject: ***

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To: rm8775@fcc.gov

Subject: Informal Comments Regarding Rule Making 8775

I will be very perturbed if the FCC opposes the notion of free speech on the Internet. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees freedom of speech.

I feel that it is unfair to curb such things as the "Voice on the Net"

Jeff Loeb
San Diego, California

No. of copies rec'd _____
List A9000

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Paul G. Storm <storm@maui.net>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 5/4/96 12:49am
Subject: RM 8775

MAY - 6 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Kevin,

As a concerned citizen, I strongly urge the FCC to reject RM 8775. It is a case of a giant corporation trying to use its influence to quash new technologies and restrict people's access to these new technologies. They have the phone lines. Don't hand them the Internet.

Thank you.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <trek@execpc.com>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 5/4/96 2:22am
Subject: Dear Sir:

Dear Sir:

I understand that you, (the FCC) are considering the elimination or "banning" of internet telephone and internet telephone technology...

I believe that would be a serious mistake... This technology has grown because there is a demand for it... It is being used by everyday people and business...

I understand that the conventional carriers are trying to keep their business safe from competition, however their service is like any other, should be subject to the free market and should try to compete in this new arena... If they are unable to compete they should go by the wayside, thrown into the ash heap of history, right next to rotary phones and Model T Fords....

Please take this letter as an indication of my desire to keep this service free and available to all that choose to use it....

Thank you very much for your time....

Sincerely

Peter S Hilger
Milwaukee, Wisconsin trek@execpc.com

Mr. J. Robert... /
LAW OFFICE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: george <vagner@spdc.ti.com>
To: A20.A20(kwerbach)
Date: 5/4/96 8:32am
Subject: Internet telephone

If internet phone is banned then any information over the net would have to be banned too. What if net-tv came to reality the commercial tv networks would bann that too?

Data is Data, no matter what we do with the data it still is data.

I am a Amateur radio operator and I have had the ability to bypass long distance charges for a long time, but i still use my telephone like i have always did just because the quality is better and the security is there.

So, just because someone found a way to do a-d then d-a fast enough to be effective as a telephone doesnt mean it should be banned.

We are supposed to promote the technical advances of the future not destroy them.

How would you like it if the Phone companies Banned all Radio Communications because it defeats their money making scheme.

It looks like the phone companies are trying to monopolize the whole world.

the phone companies provide data movement paths, so do the airwaves and the internet whichever path we choose to use is our decision not theirs.

KF7NN

Handwritten notes:
No. of copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Vickie Lockwood <lockwood@erinet.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 5:45am
Subject: Informal Comments re: ACTA petition Rulemaking No. 8775

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to add my comments to those of the others who have written in. I feel that the long distance companies have no right to interfere in this. They didn't complain about Internet Relay Chat even though that was also a form of "real time" communication over the Internet, so why should they fear this? Surely they can't really think that this will cause them to loose earnings.

Regardless of their reason, this is not their concern. This is all about the Internet, the "Information Superhighway" if you will. No one, not even the powerful ACTA should be allowed to have any say in the types of new technologies that have been developed, or will be developed in the future to allow humans to communicate with each other.

Computers have affected everyone in the modern world, in both positive and negative ways. Who was there to stand up to the phone companies when computers took away the jobs of many of their employees? The phone companies have profited greatly from computers, and now they want to stop ordinary citizens everywhere in the world from benefitting from them to the fullest.

Please make every effort to ensure that our rights as Americans are not hindered in any way, that our the freedom of speech and the right to use the Internet for this purpose is not taken away.

Respectfully,

Vickie L. Lockwood
Dayton, Ohio

lockwood@erinet.com

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABC OF _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY -6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Jon Kilburn <jkilburn@ix.netcom.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 4:17am
Subject: The ACTA Petition

I would like to voice my opposition to a ruling in favor of ACTA.

This is a technology that either slipped past them, or they never thought that it would catch on, and now they want protection from the same people that they had over the barrel for so long.

I say that they should realize that 'free enterprise' is not theirs' alone.

Respectfully,

/s/Jon Kilburn

-- Jon Kilburn Detroit Free-Net: ab125@detroit.freenet.org
PO Box 1337 NetCom: jkilburn@ix.netcom.com
Warren, MI 48090-1337 Prodigy: bsvp03a@prodigy.com
AT&T Worldnet: Jon.Kilburn@worldnet.att.net
Microsoft Network: Jon_Kilburn@msn.com

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("jeff@pulver.com")

1
No. of copies received
LIBRARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Dan Hollis <goemon@sasami.anime.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 2:25am
Subject: Informal Comments re: ACTA petition Rulemaking No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Hundt,

I strongly oppose the ACTA petition proposing regulation of telephony products on the internet.

We are already paying our local phone company (US West) for local loop service, and we are also paying a long distance provider (MCI) for leased line intra-lata service.

The ACTA's proposal is to charge the public doubly. Once for the leased line, and again for a specific type of data over those lines. This proposal is preposterous and totally nonsequitor.

As an analogy, let us use the post office for an example. You can send a letter anywhere in the united states for 29 cents. What the ACTA is proposing would be similar to the US Postal Service proposing to charge extra for the specific CONTENT of correspondence contained within those letters.

The first question that arises is: how are they to know? Shall I tell them the contents of my letter are private correspondence? And the second question arises, what business is it of theirs to know? The answer to these two questions is : I'm not going to tell them, and it's none of their business, anyway. Note that it's also illegal for them to read my mail.

The ACTA proposal also makes about as much sense as it would for the US Postal service to propose restrictions on the use of telephony for transmitting FAXes, because FAXes cut into the US Postal Service's market for transporting letters.

Many companies use leased lines to provide voice and data services between locations, often intra-lata. What the ACTA is proposing would have a sickening strangle hold on this technology, and on telephony and digital communications technology overall.

An FCC ruling to support the ACTA proposal would set a horrifyingly stifling precedent that will have a severely negative impact on the development of emerging telephony technology.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

-Dan Hollis
Oregon, USA

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("sandy@von.org","jeff@pulver.com")

No. of Copies Rec'd
List ADDED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Tony Safina <tony@iglou.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/4/96 3:07am
Subject: Comment Sought on ACTA Internet Phone Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear FCC Representative,

I am a registered user of Vocaltec Inc.'s "Internet Phone" program. I registered it almost immediately because of the thrill of the idea of being able to communicate vocally with other Internet users around the world. Well, let me tell you, registering so soon was a mistake -- such a waste of nearly sixty dollars! I used the program, in all, probably less than fifty times, likely not even that many. It is a royal pain to get the program properly configured and only true techies will be able to do it. I am somewhat of a techie, so I was able to get it configured after numerous consultations with friends, but nonetheless it was still a pain in the neck.

The program can work quite well when all the conditions are right and when the person at the other end has his/her program set up as well as yours, but most conversations go something like this:

Me: Hello? My name is Tony. What is your name?
He: Hello? Speak up, I can't hear you?
Me: Are you using a registered copy or a 90 second trial copy?
He: Hello? Are you there? Bring the microphone a little closer to your mouth.
Me: Oh, sorry. Can you here me now?
He: Yes, but what's that whistle in the background?
Me: Oh, sorry, I must have my mike too close to my speakers.
He: Well, I can hear you a little better now. Where are you calling from?
Me: I'm in Louisville, KY. Where are you?
He: I'm in Hong Kong.
Me: Oh, I've never been there. Have you ever been to Louisville?
He: No. I've never been there.
Me: Have you ever been to the United States?
He: Yes, I went to school in Boston for two years.
Me: Oh, I've never been to Boston. Did you like it here?
He: What did you say? You are getting hard to hear again.
Me: Yeah, you too, in fact I am not quite sure when to talk because my "talk" button never turns green. It is red all the time so I have to kind of guess when it's my turn.

Well, 90% of all my Internet Phone conversations have been like this one. It is a great idea, if the Internet could handle continuous data streams effectively without those awful lags, if the programs could be instantly configured and work perfect every time, then I am sure I would use the program more than I do. Presently, however, I think it is little more than a fancy toy and I do not think the use of such programs should be regulated by the FCC. There are enough regulations as it is. My quadriplegic brother recently got his ham license and while he passed the test on the first try, he almost failed because the examiner didn't even follow the FCC regulations and apparently was not aware that handicapped people were allowed to take the test in a different fashion than non-handicapped people. This is an example where a regulation was not even followed. That may be because there are too many regulations as it is?

Isn't it enough to work for a living, pay taxes, pay one's keep, mind the Ten Commandments to the best of one's ability, and then cope with the events of everyday life as well as possible? If a few thousand people enjoy using the Internet Phone just for fun, if a few thousand people get a few short-lived thrills from sharing their thoughts and aspirations with people in far away lands, it is my opinion the government (specifically, the FCC) should not stand in the way.

Go after the real troublemakers, people who are really a threat to the communications networks of America, not a few thousand home hobbyists that get a few small pleasures from using a toy like the Internet Phone.

I hope my comments against any contemplated legislation will make a difference.

Respectfully yours,

Tony Safina

Not on Super record
Date: 5/4/96

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

425 S. Hubbards Lane, #431

Louisville, KY 40207-4086

Voice: 502/899-3723

Fax: 502/899-1628

E-mail: txsafi01@homer.louisville.edu or, tony@iglou.com or, chtk36a@prodigy.com

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("WENDELL_FORD@ford.senate.gov")

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Larry Butler <kn4im@worldnet.att.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 11:35am
Subject: Response

MAY -6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In light of ACTA's recent filing to eliminate audio transmissions on the Internet, the enforcement of a ban of which would be like trying to keep CBers from working DX on 27 Mhz. I feel it is mandatory that consumers respond.

I have read this defensive reaction of ACTA with amusement and have reflected back some 30 years ago to a time when Amateur Radio Operators were forbidden by the FCC to operate telephone interconnects to our VHF/UHF repeaters, which is now a widely used tool for the public good. The FCC and the politicians, at the time controlled by the deep pockets of a certain telephone giant, was very quick to write regulations strictly forbidding any such interconnections with quite silly excuses about it causing harm to the telephone system, causing ham operators to crash their cars by talking on the phone while driving, etc., etc. This was, of course, a smoke-screen to the REAL reason for the ban, protecting the aforementioned giant corporation from any bypass to the status quo, it's mobile telephone service.

Now, we have another lobby calling in its political markers demanding that new technologies be totally banned in protection of corporate profits from companies that have been ripping off the American consumer with the aid and abetment of the government bureaucracy since the late 1800's. But, are they going to lose profits? I think not.

I would like to compare the use of Internet telephone programs with the FCC's Amateur Radio Service. They are exactly the same idea, only the method of this new communications is different. Instead of using the airwaves with RF, we are using (and paying heavily for I might add) the data capabilities of the federal government sponsored Internet. The contacts I, and millions of other voters, make on the internet whether by keyboard communications (not mentioned in ACTA's objections to my communications), or by conversion of my voice to .wav data and transmitted compressed through my little pinhole modem, are ALL exactly like my communications at KN4IM to amateurs worldwide. We have a group of people, who are merely communicating as amateurs do, in CHANCE encounters via our modem and computer links. The ONLY real difference in these communications is that

I am PAYING for SERVICE from AT&T to connect me to the internet....On Amateur Radio, I pay noone. The communications, for probably 99% of the time, has no monetary value, has no meaning except to meet new people from distant places... just like ham radio! I do my actual business communications on the Internet's

E-mail system, which will probably be under DIRECT attack by the US Postal Service lawyers next because I have bypassed entirely the Postal Service, as do billions of others DAILY...including AFTA's members. Will this open a Pandora's

Box at the FCC? Of course! Isn't this the point? We'll feed thousands of greedy lawyers for years from the taxpayer's trough, as usual.

The communications that take place, if you will go to <http://www.vocaltec.com> and download your free trial program, are EXACTLY like AMATEUR RADIO! Will we once again try to ban Amateur Radio operations next? No difference, Not a bit.

Click up the CALL button, pick the TOPICS section, click the REFRESH button.

Now, look at the TOPICS on Iphone. There are SCADS of sex topics, humans one and all. Look down the list and you'll find that ALMOST ALL topics have NOTHING to do with ANY bypass of AFTA's precious revenues. There are hundreds of HAM

RADIO TYPE contacts being made AT RANDOM by logging onto a topic, picking a COMPLETE STRANGER, and connecting to him. How many of these random connects would happen, making money for AFTA, IF WE BAN IT ALL??? NONE! THERE IS NO WAY TO MAKE RANDOM CONTACTS ON THEIR PRECIOUS PRIVATE TELEPHONE CALLS! This is ALL amateur radio type communications all over the world.

So, what's the problem? The problem is that AFTA is afraid IBM or GM will adopt this new form of communications! This is also NOT an issue. IBM has been using interoffice data communications INSTEAD of long distance telephone tariffs FOR YEARS! All companies now use Email instead of USPS! At the price, email is a great alternative. I dare say that even YOUR OFFICE bypasses the more expensive routes. Does the FCC use its radio system instead of stopping by a pay phone and feeding AFTA quarters to call the office? OF COURSE it does! Have you ever picked up AFTA's phone in the evening and called any number at random just to talk to a stranger?

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCOE

1

Of course you haven't! THESE TWO SYSTEMS
ARE ENTIRELY DIFFERENT! AFTA's long distance services are PRIVATE between
PRIVATE individuals...IPHONE is PUBLIC between STRANGERS. just like Amateur
Radio!

Please, just this once, vote on the side of LOGIC. Reject AFTA's claims for the stupidity they are!

Thank you,
Larry Butler, kn4im@worldnet.att.net, voter

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECORDED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Warren S. Apel <warren@indirect.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 2:24pm
Subject: Internet Telephony

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Please don't let the mega-corporations strangle the internet by making companies like VocalTec and iPhone pay outrageous fees.

Internet telephony is a wonderful new technology that shouldn't be cut down by these companies.

Thanks!

* Protect the freedom the flag stands for *
* not the cloth from which it's made! *

Warren S. Apel warren@indirect.com <http://www.indirect.com/www/warren/>

* When Cryptography is Outlawed, *
* Only XWQVZq OeMiYs QpWXox *

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Steve Briggs <steve@wowpages.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 3:12pm
Subject: RM No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I would like to voice my extremely strong opposition to the petition filed by ACTA. The rulings they request are simply an attempt to prevent competition with their established services and would violate the spirit if not the law of American commerce. I do not know what is in the Communications Act of 1934, but its provisions cannot possibly take into account the technological breakthroughs of the last 60 years, most significantly the Internet. This petition must be rejected.

Thank you.

Steve Briggs http://www.wowpages.com/
Wow Pages, Inc. 1.800.WOW.1032
Web Site Design and Hosting ME 207.741.2570

steve@wowpages.com VT 802.860.6682

No. of Copies rec'd. 1
List ASODE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Chuck Rice <Chuck@WildRice.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 8:39pm
Subject: Petition to control Internet Voice Development

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As an American Citizen, I want to urge the FCC to stay out of the Internet.
It needs another 5 to 10 years to mature, and FCC involvement would stifle innovation at this point.

The telephone providers already have a large chunk of the internet as most of the traffic is already carried (at least in some parts of the data path) over the common carrier lines and thus has all of the regulation we need.

Please deny the petition. -Chuck-

Chuck Rice

Chuck@WildRice.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABOVE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Lazarus <Lazarus@digital.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 2:00pm
Subject: ACTA petition Rulemaking No. 8775

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I know you folks at the FCC are going to get a lot of arcane arguments about why this petition is bad, so I'd like to keep it simple and focus on what this petition is really attempting to do.

This petition, which seeks to ban voice telephony over the Internet, is a 'buggy whip' petition - that is, it is a blatant move to shut down progress by citing how it will injure existing businesses and industries - namely, those who have forwarded the petition.

The explosion of new ways to utilize the Internet is one of the most exciting developments of our time. When automobiles came along, the horse and buggy industries were wiped out. We will witness similar transitions, some of them painful, resulting from the expansion of the Internet and the capabilities. These changes will have a profound impact on our lives.

Some firms in the business of providing traditional telephone access will adapt to these changes, and some will not. But the best forum for sorting out the winners from the losers is a free market, not a bureaucratic solution. If the FCC supports this petition, it will stifle ingenuity and hand some billion-dollar crybabies a market position they should only earn by doing good business, instead of government decree.

I urge the FCC to summarily reject this petition and urge the petitioners to look to the free market if they wish to serve their customers well.

- Kevin McLeod
1656 24th Avenue
Vero Beach, FL 32960
Lazarus@digital.net

No. of Copies sold _____
List ABOVE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Nathan Dintenfass <ndintenfass@creativeis.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 3:35pm
Subject: Internet Telephony

I am writing to express my concern about the recent challenge to the use of the Internet as a "phone" allowing people an alternative to existing telephone networks.

I feel that preventing the use of Internet phone systems would seriously curtail the development of a promising new medium. Although the concerns about bandwidth may be warranted, it would not be prudent to base decisions about the future of an emerging technology that has proven its ability to adapt to new technologies based on these concerns. The Internet represents a potentially empowering technology that can be used to connect people globally that would otherwise not have a realistic means of communication.

I urge you to keep the Internet as open as possible and avoid undue regulation of this promising new medium.

Thank You,

Nathan Dintenfass ndintenfass@creativeis.com

No. of copies rec'd _____
Listed on _____

1

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Rob Rogers <rerogers@ix.netcom.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 4:53pm
Subject: Public comment on RM No. 8775

MAY - 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The obvious attempt to cripple an emerging competitor by the telecommunication industry is outrageous. Here is my objections from a business user of the internet not interested in internet "phone calls":

- 1) Data is data - The internet can not distinguish realtime voice data from other types of voice data. I would not want my presentations containing voice data or word documents with voice annotation being restricted.
- 2) Preventing the sales of these programs until the FCC can regulate them is ridiculous. Its like preventing the sale of electric vehicals until they can be UL listed!!
- 3) Since when has the FCC had the right to regulate software.
- 4) This software could be used on dedicated lines between two companies which would not be under FCC control. So how can the FCC control software which may be used for uses outside their control. This is restriction of trade.

I'm sure there is several more reasons why this is a very very bad idea.

Please don't bow to these powerful lobbist.

Rob Rogers rerogers@ix.netcom.com
5602 Brownridge
Shawnee, KS 66218

No. of Copies rec'd _____ 1
DATE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 6 1996

From: Ro Nagey <ronagey@design-design.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/5/96 7:13pm
Subject: RM No. 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am thouroughly in favor of unrestricted access to the Internet - whether via keyboard, voice or video.

Your job is to regulate limited resources. Clearly, the Internet is, by definition, unlimited.

Do not artificially prop up companies using old technology that are seeking corporate welfare through restrictive regulations.

We have little left in America where we lead the world ... our ability to create and implement new technology is one of the few areas.

Please focus instead on overly large companies owning a disproportionate share of TV radio and phone services.

Let the Internet be.

Ro Nagey
300 Cedar Lane
Largo, FL 34640

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ACCDE _____

1