

Proponents of exclusive contracts dispute whether it has been proven that every single PCO with an exclusive contract covering an MDU mistreats the tenants of that MDU, or it is only most that do so.

They argue that no PCO should be prevented from obtaining and enforcing exclusive contracts without the consent of the tenants, because there might, hypothetically speaking, come a time when a PCO decides to treat a tenant like a human being, and not like the property of the landlord. (The concept that tenants are owned by landlords is not my original idea; it comes from the website of a PCO that used language which reminded me of those once used to oppose the abolition of slavery.)

I would like to respond to this absurd claim as follows:

It has not been proven that everyone who wishes to enter the FCC's offices at 3 A.M. is a thief. Someone might have a legitimate reason for doing so. Therefore, following the line of reasoning of those who oppose the proposed ban on exclusive contracts, the FCC should not lock the doors to its offices, and should instead keep them unlocked 24 hours a day. Of course, its computers will be stolen within a few days, as will many of its confidential files.

However, according to this line of reasoning, such thefts are the necessary price to ensure that we do not prevent the covert entry of someone who wishes to enter in the middle of the night to do a good deed, should such a person hypothetically exist. Santa Claus, for example.

Should the FCC reject this nonsense, and decide that the doors should be locked at night, because it is aware that legitimate visitors can wait until morning, then it should also ban exclusive contracts, because legitimate service providers can obtain voluntary customers, and do not need to depend on exclusive contracts or bulk billing.