

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the matter of)
)
Office of Engineering and Technology) ET Docket No. 10-123
Requests Information on Use of)
1675-1710 MHz Band)

REPLY COMMENTS OF JAMES EDWIN WHEDBEE TO T-MOBILE'S COMMENTS

To the Commission:

The undersigned Commenter, JAMES EDWIN WHEDBEE, respectfully submits these reply comments in opposition to those of T-Mobile's comments previously submitted on June 28, 2010.

The fact is that wireless broadband providers have ample spectrum and there is no shortage, all whining to the contrary: if not, they wouldn't allow available spectrum to lie fallow (3650-3700 MHz) while complaining they need more. That the wireless broadband providers have promised certain things to certain political figures is no secret either. It seems a common ploy to deny quid pro quo when it stares one in the face these days: money (auctions) for spectrum (the government licenses out to the highest bidder) - no more glaring and obvious a case of bribery existed had the Romans themselves invented it. In essence, the wireless broadband providers promise money in exchange for rules and regulations beneficial to themselves and allowing them to profit.

So, rather than beat around the bush, let's see it the way it is: wireless broadband doesn't need the spectrum, but would like to include that spectrum in its inventory together with policies singularly favoring that industry over other telecommunications operators. They're willing to promise elaborate

amounts of money in exchange for the license; even to share the wealth with those broadcasters whom are willing to part with spectrum. That said, it would appear with the backing of the White House and certain Congressional leaders, this will happen in spite of those of us putting it on the record that this effort is the result of a lie and a bribe (I suspect multiple bribes, actually).

Call what I'm suggesting hyperbole if you wish, but I mean it as a matter of fact because the record cannot belie it: T-Mobile in a related proceeding (Docket No. 10-123, Page 6 of their June 28, 2010 Comments) stated this: "These circumstances may lead to diminished wireless industry interest in the 1.6 GHz band (if paired with the 2155-2180 MHz band), resulting in reduced auction revenues." While they'll undoubtedly deny what I'm saying vehemently, what it appears they are basically saying to the FCC is this: "Give us what we want or we'll see to it the auctions aren't as successful as you planned." That's quid pro quo. Nevertheless, there may be a way to accommodate wireless broadband providers and still be fair to the rest of us.

If, as it would appear President Obama desires the FCC to do, the Commission proceeds to implement spectrum policies which assure that wireless broadband gets its additional 500 MHz of spectrum, including 120 MHz from TV broadcast; and if, as it would appear the wireless broadband service providers prepared to do, wireless broadband provides services similar in content as cable companies, then I propose wireless broadband be treated as would a cable company with all the must-carry requirements. Furthermore, if wireless broadband operators stray into broadcasting, radiolocation, or other regulatory fields of telecommunications by way of their newly fetched spectrum from their servants within the NTIA, FCC, and above, I propose that if those same operators stray into other fields (broadcasting, radiolocation, and related services), they should be required to comply with those same rules and regulations as apply to those other fields. Finally, I recommend that wireless broadband be

regulatorily barred from competing with any TV, LPTV, or TV Translator station it displaces as a result of this policy change.

Respectfully,

/s./ James Edwin Whedbee, M.Ed.
5816 NE Buttonwood Tree Lane
Gladstone, MO 64119-2236
June 29, 2010 @ 2230 CDT
Owner: KZJW-LD