

Ron +++++' reply to: "Joint reply of New Operating Globalstar LLC, Globalstar L.P., L/Q Licensee, Inc., and Thermo Capital Partners, L.L.C."

Please allow me to respond to Mr. Wallace' presentation to the commission. On page 2 of his presentation Mr. Wallace refers to me as "*A disgruntled shareholder in a public company*". Apparently Mr. Wallace is unaware that it has become abundantly clear many shareholders (and bondholders) have good reason to be "disgruntled" for they've been cheated and swindled. Is this one of those situations? There's a lot of indication toward that end.

Mr. Wallace claims:

"As explained briefly below, neither Mr. +++++'s nor Iridium's comments provide any reason for the Commission to delay processing and grant of the pending applications."

Nothing could be further from the truth. The honesty and trust of the stock market has been and continues to be severely tarnished by improprieties of the "greedy". Even President Bush has expressed deep concern. The ENRON wrong doing continues with CEO Skilling being led away in handcuffs yesterday (Feb 18, 2004) and charged with so many crimes the prosecutors states (att. 1):

"Skilling faced up to 325 years in prison and more than \$80 million in fines if convicted of all counts"

The very same evening (yesterday) 60 Minutes II aired an informative story regarding Noreen Harrington' whistle-blowing. Elliott Spitzer labeled investors as "*cheated*" of "*Billions and Billions of dollars*". The story also labeled illegal trades that were, "*so subtle, and so insidious, they went on right under the nose of regulators.*" Could a different kind of "cheating" be going on here, right under the nose of the FCC? They also stated had Ms. Harrington not come forward it would still be going on. What does this have to do with the transfer of the license Loral/Qualcomm S.S. to Thermo Capital? It is of my opinion that too many things lead to the conclusion there is improper manipulation of this publicly traded company, and they may now be attempting to include the FCC in the process. If that is the case, I don't think the transfer of the license would be in any ones "best interest" except the monopolistic few attempting to achieve such a wrong. Such wrongs certainly wouldn't be in the "best interest of the public".

There have been numerous indications Globalstar, prior to coming before the commission, has intentionally manipulated their business so as NOT to show a profitable company. For example, July 2001, shortly after it was made known Globalstar "may"

declare bankruptcy, and just after founding partner Qualcomm had made an offer to invest \$500 Million in Globalstar (att. #2) demanding bankruptcy, Qualcomm pulled their 1620 data-modem off the market (att. #3, pg. 6):

“While we were at the Jacksonville meeting, Qualcomm called to notify us that they are no longer going to sell or support the 1620 satellite data modem.”

This in and by itself seems strange, but its discontinuance was just weeks after a test by NASA which Jay Pittman (Advanced Range Technology Initiative engineer at Wallops) had said of the products use (att. #4, pg. 2):

"When perfected, the Flight Modem could become a pervasive presence in aircraft and launch vehicle activities and the basis for development of applications that haven't even been thought of yet. We could imagine science or even commercial aircraft 'phoning in' data for analysis from anywhere in the world and from any kind of platform. The cost is so low and the concept so simple it is hard to predict where and how this technology will be used."

It doesn't pass the test of common sense, unless perhaps the company is intentionally driving itself to bankruptcy to eventually own it all to themselves by virtually eliminating stockholders and bondholders. And note he stated, “We could imagine science or even commercial aircraft phoning in data for analysis from anywhere in the world.”. Globalstar has been included in AEEC/Arinc specs 429, 619, 743A (an ex. in att. 5) for airliners.

I had stated previously where Globalstar refused to provide phones to Star MD resulting in a lawsuit (att. #6):

***“The complaint alleges Globalstar USA repeatedly refused to ship hundreds of satellite telephones for which StarMD had found purchasers. Jim Carney, StarMD's counsel said:
"StarMD was generating substantial revenue and on track with a program targeted to sell over 10,000 Globalstar phones and service plans in 2003 when Globalstar abruptly stopped shipping phones to StarMD. All attempts by StarMD principals to reach Globalstar's president, Tony Navarra, for an explanation has been unsuccessful." “***

A few paragraphs down in the article, Mr. Harris, of Star MD states:

"We are baffled by their actions," says George Harris of StarMD. "You would think a company in bankruptcy would welcome the additional business that we were bringing to them. Our new marketing programs were generating about as much new business as the entire US channel. We just don't understand why they would turn away business at this juncture."

I think the FCC is in agreement with Mr. Harris' bewilderment. A company in bankruptcy would "welcome the additional business", not drive it away. So why didn't Globalstar? Something's wrong. Could it be they intentionally are trying to bankrupt the company even though it could be prevented, and are attempting to persuade the FCC to unknowingly help in their endeavor? In my first letter I showed an outsider of Globalstar was in talks with the South Korean Military for a half billion dollar contract. That would have saved the entire company from bankruptcy (and this license transfer) but apparently wasn't heeded. A company run by Loral and Qualcomm couldn't be that incompetent.

The previous examples alone should be enough to peak the interest of the FCC to the point as to how Globalstar has come before the commission to ask the license be transferred to a, for the most part, "private company". But there are so many more if someone will just take the time to look.

Aero Astro uses only the Globalstar Satellite network for its SIMS modem. A million modems were ordered back in 2002 (att. # 7):

"This has pushed AeroAstro eight years ahead into their Business plan. An order has been placed for 1,000,000 field units and the satellite service provider have contributed about \$400,000 to the system development."

The commission should also note they (the FCC) approved a modification to Globalstars Big Leo license (SES-MOD-20021010-01758, E970381) May of 2003, doubling the MES units to 1,000,000 MES units, of which 490,000 of the increase are "simplex transmitters for remote telemetry" (i.e. AeroAstros, although the current AeroAstro modems are using the current Globalstar Satellite system).

Also, a December press release by AeroAstro states (att. #8):

"Since the commercial launch of the simplex data services in Mid-August 2003, more than 30 companies are now actively building the transmitter (STU) into their products."

Yet, somehow Globalstar still is before the commission because they claim they can't make it and need to sell out to a private company.

I also note Mr. Wallace doesn't address what happened to the "immediate" implementation of MSS-ATC. In the Feb 8, 2002 presentation to the FCC (IB docket 01-185), the "Informal Noteholders Committee of Globalstar, L.P. stated such things as:

"Because the satellites are in place, Globalstar can move quickly to implement ATC and fully realize the resulting public interest benefits." (pg 3)

"Dramatically expanding MSS revenues and subscribership by reducing MSS prices, reducing MSS handset size, and overcoming MSS reception limitations." (pg 4)

"Improving the business case for MSS, thereby enabling the MSS industry to raise the capital necessary to construct replacement and new satellite systems." (pg 4)

The FCC passed MSS ATC to give companies like Globalstar a helping hand and prevent bankruptcy, but nothing appears to have been done by Globalstar other than to reject things that would show a profit just so they can be SURE to complete bankruptcy.

Conclusion:

In my opinion the Globalstar/ Thermo deal is a scam of the highest magnitude, not much less than the ENRON's and the other scams, just done in a different manner. The FCC can't be sure unless the commission first investigates how the two companies came to be here asking to transfer such a valuable and powerful license. Such investigation would truly be in the public's "best interest" and the "rush" Globalstar has been claiming for years should be subdued for the thoroughness and accuracy of the commission.

Should the FCC require additional files I would be happy to oblige? I have enough to fill a small library. Military (Win-T, JTRS, universal phone, etc.). Much too numerous to present here. In my opinion they're hiding a gold mine.