

LETTER SPOTLIGHT: LAWRENCE J. SPIWAK

## Bell regional fiefdoms just a newer, tighter monopoly

December 15, 2002

In a bad sign for the future of local telephone competition, the Bell telephone monopolies are slicing the nation's local phone market into regional fiefdoms and agreeing to stay out of each other's territories.

Implicitly confirmed in a recent statement by Qwest CEO Richard Notebaert, the arrangement is bad news for consumers in Indiana and across the Midwest who are hoping competition will inspire better service by SBC/Ameritech.

"It might be a good way to turn a quick dollar, but that doesn't make it right," Notebaert told The Chicago Tribune when asked if his company, the dominant phone company in 14 Western states, would begin offering residential phone service in the Midwestern states dominated by Ameritech.

For consumers in Indiana, this collusive arrangement is one more frustration in dealing with SBC/Ameritech, which has been assessed more than \$1 billion in fines and pending penalties for a variety of service failures and anti-competitive actions in the past six years. Among the assessments are 23 consecutive monthly fines by federal regulators as well as Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell's slap at SBC last month for "unlawful, anti-competitive behavior."

As a bit of background, when the landmark Telecommunications Act was enacted in 1996, there were seven Bells. Now, through mergers and acquisitions, we are down to four behemoths: SBC, Verizon, Bell South and Qwest.

Moreover, two of the Bells alone -- SBC and Verizon -- each control more than one-third of all access lines in America.

As if this massive reconcentration of the local markets is not bad enough for consumers, the Bells have now publicly admitted what we have known intuitively for years: They have absolutely no intention of competing in each other's markets.

Clearly, the Bells fully understand -- as so many would-be competitors discovered to their peril -- that entry is extremely hard and expensive. As such, they recognize the obvious. It is far easier to protect your own monopoly than it is to fight another monopolist on its home turf. Not only won't they compete against each other, they don't want anybody else to compete against them either.

Ever since the 1996 Telecommunications Act was signed into

law, the Bells have launched a coordinated campaign against the cornerstone of the act: the fact that they must open their markets to competition by leasing to rivals the phone network elements that competitors need to deliver service to consumers.

Now that regulators in a number of states, including Illinois, Ohio and Michigan, have set wholesale rates for the leases at appropriate levels, consumers are beginning to see lower prices and more choices. But the Bells continue to resist the process, even though they get a prize by gaining the right to sell long-distance phone service for the first time in states where local markets are opened to competition.

Consumers should understand exactly what is going on here. Absent an environment conducive to competition, we are simply reconstituting the old AT&T Bell system -- a monopoly for both local and long-distance service on a regional rather than on a national level.

And don't think your wireless phone will be a competitive option in this environment: Not only are there technical limitations, but the largest wireless companies -- Verizon Wireless and Cingular -- are owned by three of the four Bells. As such, the Bells have absolutely no intention of having their wireless operations cannibalize their profitable local wire-line monopolies. Why sell consumers one product when you can sell them two?

Given the Bells' consistent refusal to enter each other's territories and the public confirmation from Qwest of the arrangement, it is time for the U.S. Department of Justice and state antitrust officials to launch an inquiry into this apparent collusive behavior.

Concurrently, both the FCC and state regulators must continue to ensure that local markets are open to all competitors via a healthy, competitive wholesale market for "last-mile" network access so that competing local phone providers can continue to serve their customers.

Despite the Bells' alleged collusion, competition in local phone service is starting to take hold. Regulators must stay the course, resisting the Bells' entreaties for higher wholesale phone rates as well as enormous pressure for federal rule changes that would free them from sharing phone networks with rivals.

Otherwise, telephone competition will be a promise unfulfilled.

---

Spiwak is president of the Phoenix Center for Advanced Legal and Economic Public Policy Studies ([www.phoenix-center.org](http://www.phoenix-center.org)), an international nonprofit think tank based in Washington, D.C. He is a former senior attorney with the competition division in the Federal Communications Commission's Office of General Counsel.

Links to external sites will open a new browser. IndyStar.com does not endorse external sites.