COMMENTARY

Anger over Time Warner pricing raises questions

Time Warner Cable has backed down, at least for now, from its attempt to introduce tiered pricing for Internet service in Greensboro. The company announced earlier this month that it would test the new pricing model here and in three other cities around the country.

VIEWPOINT
ANDREW BROD

Instead of a monthly fee that allows unlimited usage, tiered pricing would establish rates for usage up to 10, 20, 40, and 60 gigabytes (GBs) of data transfer per month. Other usage levels were proposed as well. Going over one's usage "cap" would trigger a fee of $1 per GB.

The outrage generated by the announcement was impressive. Blogs exploded with righteous indignation, commentators opined, editorials disapproved. And TWC blinked, announcing that it would delay the introduction.

The protesters accused TWC of greed, in particular because the move might drive movie-watchers to its cable television service. That might be true. But nearly every company we can think of tries to steer customers to more profitable lines.

The protesters claimed that tiered pricing is unfair. This is equally dubious, because a flat monthly rate means that high-volume users are subsidized by low-volume users. I'm sure heavy users would hate to have their subsidy taken away, but that's hardly what most of us mean by "unfair."

To be sure, consumers like flat rates, because it's nice not to have to worry about the bill rising with each additional pound, minute or GB. We like the all-you-can-eat buffet. And yet consumers are happy with tiered pricing for things like cell phone service. We choose a plan, we pay a monthly fee based on a level of usage, and if we go over the "cap," we pay a per-minute fee. Sounds familiar, doesn't it?

The most interesting argument against tiered pricing is that it will hurt high-tech entrepreneurs who use the Internet intensively. Apparently such businesses shouldn't have to pay for that intensity. By that reasoning we should pay part of their light bills as well.

Of course it makes sense to lower some hurdles for entrepreneurs. That's why we have publicly funded business incubators and tax breaks for small businesses. But these are examples of public subsidies. And that leads us to the root cause of the outrage.

We've begun to see the Internet as a part of our economic infrastructure. Of course Internet access isn't as important for human survival as, say, food. But grocery stores operate in highly competitive markets that give us some comfort about the fairness of their prices. The market for cell phone service, home of tiered pricing that we don't mind, is also highly competitive.

In contrast, the cable modem is the fastest game in town, and there's only one way to get it: through your local cable monopoly. In many cities, cable operators compete, and guess what? Prices are lower and quality is higher.

Therefore, one solution is to encourage competition among cable providers. That might be tough in smaller cities, however. You tend to see competitive cable in big cities like New York and Chicago.

Another approach is to acknowledge that in the New Economy, Internet access is more like a road network or a water system than a can of soup. Fairness matters for infrastructure access, and the fairest way to provide it is via government ownership and control.

If a government solution is unappealing and competition is too hard to foster, then the only hope for the protesters is that the current system of state regulation will preserve the subsidy for heavy Internet use.

ANDREW BROD *is the director of UNCG's Center for Business and Economic Research and a member of The Business Journal's Editorial Board of Contributors. Reach him at (336)334-4867 or AndrewBrod@uncg.edu. An archive of Brod's columns is available at http://cber.uncg.edu.*

How to gauge an economic turnaround

Everyone seems to be asking, "When will the economy turn around?"

I know how to tell with certainty when it is turning. I call it *The Wall Street Journal* Headline Economic Activity Gauge.

Before I explain how it works, I want to comment about what we've heard from our government as well as from Main Street: that banks are not lending and, until they do so, our economy won't turn around.

In many parts of the country, including North Carolina, banks and many commercial finance companies, insurance firms and other non-bank lenders are lending — though thoughtfully and cautiously as they should be in an uncertain economy. A reasonable amount of debt is available for well-run, middle-market companies that are maintaining stable revenues and profit margins.

As I see it, availability of credit for middle-market companies is not the factor hampering the growth of the economy and the creation of jobs. The main issues are the lack of demand for consumer products or services.

The consumer is hunkered down, hoping not to lose his job. Companies are hesitant to take on anything but the least amount of debt possible. They are delaying building inventories and acquiring new equipment.

Notwithstanding the trillions of our tax dollars the federal government throws at it, the economy will not turn around until we have worked through the excess of the recent past — way too much residential and commercial real estate, way too many retail stores providing products that we can no longer afford, way too many models of automobiles that use too much gas and way too many auto dealerships that try to sell us those cars.

Only then will consumers start buying again and will businesses start seeing demand for their products and services and start borrowing to grow their businesses to meet that demand.

"So," you ask, "when will that happen?"

And my answer is, "look to *The Wall Street Journal* Headline Economic Activity Gauge." Simply put, count the number of *Journal* business article headlines that are positive, neutral and negative in each edition. When the balance changes from negative to positive, you can bet the economy is improving. A recent example:

Positive (6): 19 percent
Neutral (3): 10 percent
Negative (22): 71 percent

Maybe not terribly scientific, but you get the point. We still have a ways to go before things improve. But don't blame the banks for not aggressively lending in this environment.

That's how we got into this mess in the first place.

BIFF BARNARD *is a partner of Wood Warren & Co. Securities LLC, an Emeryville, Calif.-based investment banking firm.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Business Journal invites letters to the editor in response to stories, opinion pieces or issues of importance to the Triad.

Brevity is advised. Letters should include the author's name and daytime phone number.

Letters may be mailed to: 100 S. Elm St., Suite 400, Greensboro, 27401; or sent by e-mail to the editor at msutter@bizjournals.com.