

The argument presented claims that two telecom mergers currently under review, Verizon and MCI, and SBC and AT&T, are vital if these telecom giants are to compete in "today's communications market (made) far different than that of twenty years ago ... (by) innovations such as e-mail, instant messaging, high-speed wireless communications, and Voice-over-Internet Protocol (VoIP)".

I disagree.

If the intent of the mergers are specifically to compete in the world of IP connectivity, why are these very similar companies merging? If each of the four companies are trying to compete in an industry that has left them behind, why are they not looking for companies that specialize in those new technologies? This is a consolidation of one specific industry, telecom. The proposed mergers do nothing to enhance the abilities of these four giants, except to reduce the competition.

It is true that VoIP has devastated long-distance telecoms, but only because for two decades they wouldn't let go of out-dated market-inefficient pricing strategies . These mergers are a rear guard action by corporations whose actions in the wake of IP telephony were anything but friendly to consumers.

And isn't the whole point of free markets to promote efficiencies that benefit the market?

No, this is all about corporatism and oligarchies, not free-market principles.