

I am amazed at how many people I talk to who are in opposition to the merger of SBC and AT&T and yet we see an outpouring of support in the filed comments here. I think maybe a survey should be taken from time to time to see what people really think about issues like this.

It is common sense that allowing the re-combining of SBC and AT&T will not help improve competition in any way whatsoever. SBC and AT&T have always worked to make sure that independent ISPs and other competitors have a difficult time operating in the telecommunications space. Allowing them to merge is supposed to help this matter? This attempt to merge these two companies will do little to help and in fact will harm the efforts of pioneers like WISPs, VOIP operators, Fiber to the Home operators, Muni-Broadband projects and others who are truly leading the way to rural broadband and other opportunities for technological telecommunications advancement in this country.

These two companies were split apart in the past for a reason. They were in a monopoly position which was not helping the consumer. Allowing them to merge only strengthens the negative impact they will have on the future of technology in the United States and will harm consumers through the ability for SBC-AT&T to hold back innovations of smaller operations to compete.

The United States is built on innovations which in large part come from small business. Allowing two massive companies to merge who were previously split because of monopoly issues is counter-productive. I think that these two companies should be tasked to give measurable goals to achieve prior to allowing this to happen at a minimum. I think that there should be penalties for them that are harsh if it is found that they are working to stop competition in the telecommunications fields. What has materially changed for these two companies that has made them better corporate players than they were when they were split before?