

Dear FCC Commissioners & Staff:

I have to send this to you by electronic means because I only recently found out about the deadline.

My name is Matthew Danak and I would like to offer my opinion on your pending decision regarding RBOCs (regional bells). It is my understanding that the FCC is considering the removal of the current requirement that the RBOCs must provide network access to ISPs. I think it would be a mistake to remove the requirement.

While I do not have hard numbers for your consideration, I would guess that there are thousand within my state alone who depend on local ISPs for both their business and personal needs. Nationally, I would assume millions will be affected by your decision. If you choose to, in effect, block my ISPs access to, in this case, Bellsouth's network, it is not likely that they will be able to continue selling broadband Internet access via ADSL. I can't imagine anything coming from this but further limitation of consumer choice. Small, local ISPs will be forced out of business if you allow monopolistic (partially regulated companies like the Bells still have monopolistic tendencies) companies like the RBOCs and the Cable-based broadband providers to exclude ISPs from their networks. I do not consider AOL/Time Warner's access to some cable networks as anything more than a token opening of the cable lines.

ISPs did much to spur the growth of what we now call the Internet back as early as the late 80s. The telephone companies did not start providing Internet access until the late 90s. Now you want to reward them with exclusive use of the telephone network, which was indirectly funded by taxpayers. Since ADSL uses the same pair of copper as phone call, why is that segment OK to restrict? A decision to allow only the largest corporate players access to broadband is, in my opinion, un-American to the extreme. Competition between mega-corporations is not true competition. It is the cancerous consequence of anti-human market forces. If market forces were sufficient, why bother with government? If market forces were sufficient, why restrict content on radio and television? Why have laws against drugs, after all, the market has clearly made its choice, no? Why then should prostitution be illegal? The market justifies many things that our laws restrict in the interest of people and the overall health of our society and, our supreme court's interpretation of our Constitution. I have lived through the consequences of AT&T's monopoly and do not wish to go back. I urge you not to let market forces, which always tend toward consolidation and monopolistic domination of entire industries, run rampant and drive smaller companies, who I would argue *started* consumer access to the Internet long before the Bells, out of business.

Please do the right thing and preserve the true competition that makes our economy the envy of the world. Please continue to protect the ISPs access to the public, yes, public telephone networks across the USA, which will protect my rights and guarantee my (and millions of others) freedom to choose from among the companies I feel will best serve my needs.

Thank you for your time, and I apologize for the ramble. If I had but one sentence to write it would be: In the name of all that is just and right, do not allow the RBOCs to block small, local ISPs from the public telephone networks.

Sincerely,

Matthew Danak
915 Franklin St.
Louisville, KY 40206