


Winners, Losers Microsoft: Competition and Antitrust in High Technology

Stan J. Liebowitz, Stephen E. Margolis
ePub | *DOC | audiobook | ebooks | Download PDF



 Download

 Read Online

#2045619 in BooksColor: Black 2001-03-01Original language:EnglishPDF # 1 9.00 x .74 x 6.00l, .98 #File Name: 0945999844302 pages | File size: 61.Mb

Stan J. Liebowitz, Stephen E. Margolis : Winners, Losers Microsoft: Competition and Antitrust in High Technology before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised Winners, Losers Microsoft: Competition and Antitrust in High Technology:

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. Winners, Losers, and MicrosoftBy Robert GavioliThis book presents

a compelling discussion of economic theory and offers scrutiny of several flawed theories of market failure with specific regard to Microsoft and the government's antitrust case against the software giant. *Winners, Losers, and Microsoft* gives noteworthy insight into the underlying assumptions of these deficient economic theories as well as into the perceptions used as their foundation of evidence. Leibowitz and Margolis point out crucial flaws in these theories which are widely used today by some economists. They also seek to destroy the government's evidence for Microsoft exhibiting a damaging monopoly role in the software industry. The authors' assertion is that markets cannot be oversimplified through questionable assumptions and faulty evidence in order to come to a convincing theory of market failure. Their main claim is simply that certain technologies win out over others in time because they are of superior quality. The text begins by offering up the economic theories that are later attempted to be disproved. The main topic of contention is the fact that some economists, especially those involved in the antitrust case against Microsoft, claim that market failure is possible in new technology industries because consumers are forced into buying inferior technologies because of network effects, the notion that consumers' buying habits are heavily influenced by the number of other consumers using that product. Further detail is explained concerning a strong kind of network effect which is also claimed to lead to market failure, a standard. Another confused claim by some economists is that Microsoft's elevated position in the software industry is detrimental to competition and a case of monopolistic harm being done, disregarding the fact that Microsoft could have had the better product. Another issue that the authors question is that economic theories of path dependence are strong support for the idea of market failure. The authors argue that there is a very real possibility that such models do not translate well to real-world situations and market processes. They go on to point out that there would be many more signs and proofs of market failure were there any validity to that theory. They explain that path dependence theories rely on evidence from past technologies that isn't reliable or even accurately reported. It is also mentioned that economics literature gives multiple inconsistent meanings to path dependence and that a system to classify path dependence at three levels is possibly appropriate. Leibowitz and Margolis define first degree path dependence as making the right predictions about the future but those decisions seeming erroneous at points along the way, but essentially no harm occurring. Second degree path dependence is described as making the wrong prediction about the future but you did so from the standpoint in which you made the right decision given the available information. Finally, third degree path dependence involves knowing that you are making the wrong or inefficient decision but still making that choice anyway. It is this third and most extreme view of path dependence that supports claims for market failure. Past technologies that are said to prove the existence of this market failure are then discussed, including the QWERTY keyboard and the VHS video system. The QWERTY keyboard was said to be an inferior technology that was harder on the user and led to slower typing speeds. The main competitor to the QWERTY, or Universal, keyboard was the Dvorak Simplified Keyboard (DSK) that was introduced in 1936. August Dvorak claimed to have designed a keyboard that he supposedly proved was easier to learn and that reduced finger movement. The QWERTY keyboard, having been patented in 1868, was designed with the keys arranged in such a way that the typewriter for which it was designed operated the best. The main piece of evidence that economists and proponents of market failure (lock in) use to support this case as being market failure is a 1944 Navy study conducted to compare typing speeds between the two types of keyboards. This study, once carefully examined, reported flawed and incomplete data yet came to a decisive conclusion. This study was also believed to have been done by Dvorak himself, an important piece of evidence. Yet somehow this data is used consistently to this day as evidence that the allegedly inferior QWERTY keyboard should have never prevailed over the DSK. Also, most of the other body of evidence for the supposed preeminence of the DSK has proven to be based on anecdotal research and inconclusive studies. The evidence for the superiority of Beta over VHS is another example of faulty reporting of research leading to misconceptions about the technology that is higher in quality. This text points out that the quality differences between Beta and VHS weren't as great as may have been reported and that, despite the slightly better picture quality, Beta lacked another feature (longer tape length) that most consumers wanted at the time of their heated competition and possessed attributes that weren't necessary to the average consumer (better editing and special effects functionality). Their conclusions on this matter were that market failure couldn't be said to have happened because the better product won the battle (VHS) and that maybe Beta was better suited for broadcasters and not the average home user. The next section of the book addresses the accusations that Microsoft demonstrated injurious monopoly actions through elevating prices and impeding superior technologies from achieving market share because of lock-in network effects. The authors show evidence through software industry price data that in the markets where Microsoft achieved control of a majority of the market share that prices actually tended to decline in every case. This evidence overrules the monopolistic accusations of Microsoft elevating prices due to control of the market by network effects. It is stated from the assembled data that, in markets where Microsoft competes, consumers have seen price declines of approximately 60%. Also taken into account is the notion that tipping, the idea that market share should grow at an ever increasing rate due to its increased attractiveness to consumers, can occur in markets where there are significant network effects. In fact, where Microsoft has dominated the market it has been shown to steadily grow to that dominance and not the sudden jumps and accelerations expected from tipping. The analysis of the spreadsheet, word processor, desktop publishing, and online services markets was intriguing because all of the criticism and accusations

of Microsoft in each of these markets seems to lack any shred of evidence. The authors' contentions are based on credible economic patterns and widely accepted principles. Through examining market share (based on revenue) and product quality (based on a multitude of reviews), it is shown that there is convincing substantiation for the claims that Microsoft dominated the markets in which it had higher quality products and did not achieve significant market share when reviews showed Microsoft's product quality lacking. These conclusions contradict the accusations of lock-in due to network effects because Microsoft's product quality was consistently rated the best when it achieved a large market share, not the anecdote that Microsoft had inferior products but succeeded due to blocking competition. The authors make convincing arguments repeatedly for the fact that the best product will come out on top in a laissez-faire economy and that this is exactly what happened time and time again with Microsoft. Following this whole discussion is the appendices of the text which offer analysis of the charges and the rulings against Microsoft by the government. There are repeated instances of the Justice Department using economists Franklin Fisher, Brian Arthur, and Garth Saloner to instill the belief of network effects, lock-in, and path dependence into the judge and jury. Disproving this evidence might have been Microsoft's best chance at saving their case considering that these theories and economic conditions are completely theoretical and have little basis in fact. Also mentioned is the fact that the Department of Justice discredited many of Microsoft's witnesses and managers, not helping the defense' dismal situation. The eventual ruling by Judge Jackson reflected the nature of Microsoft's legal defense - extremely ineffective. Jackson ruled ultimately that Microsoft was guilty of all antitrust charges brought against it but one, almost completely favoring the Department of Justice' opinion. What was the most disturbing and surprising to me was the fact that Judge Jackson implied in later interviews that he made his decision based not on the content of what the defense had to argue but on the fact that many had been discredited by their untruthfulness. Jackson also made very few changes to the government's proposed solution to the Microsoft problem because he didn't feel competent to recommend any solution himself. I think this only highlighted the fact that Judge Jackson didn't have enough knowledge or understanding of economics to rule effectively or fairly on the case, simply going by whatever the government had to recommend.

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. An incisive book shedding light far beyond the MSFT case

By Max More

This book is unfortunately titled as it is really primarily about bringing real data and rigor to bear on many of the conventional "stories" about the economics of the new economy, rather than dwelling on the Microsoft antitrust situation. Clearly, the new economy tends to be characterized by more network effects, increasing returns to scale, and general "winner-take-all" effects than the historical economy. However, certain stories about early lock-in effects of technologies that are inferior, but that by luck got the early lead, have been uncritically passed from author to author. Examples are the QWERTY keyboard, VHS vs Betamax, Windows vs Apple, etc. Liebowitz and Margolis show that most of these stories do not hold up under close examination -- that in fact, these are not examples of the market failing to take the "right path". Actually, the market generally seems to get it right. This book is also the best we have seen in its treatment of the overall economics of information technology standards.

11 of 13 people found the following review helpful. Great Book

By A Customer

There are a lot of myths about why products succeed or fail. Many claim that customers get "locked into" products simply because they arrive on the scene first even when much better products are available. Some claim that Microsoft has taken over different markets despite inferior software simply because of the monopoly that it has in operating systems. Liebowitz and Margolis provide straightforward, convincing, and imaginative evidence that these claims are false. It is amazing how many stories like the superiority of the DVORAK keyboard hang around for years with no supporting evidence. They make for great stories, but as these authors point out they are false. If you want to learn about how markets work, read this book. Finally, the previous commentor's remarks about these authors being bought off is offensive and false. Liebowitz and Margolis wrote about these issues a decade before Microsoft became involved in its current legal problems. Anyone who reads this book will realize that Microsoft would have been a lot better off if they had hired them rather than the lame effort they got from the MIT business school dean.

Few issues in high technology are as divisive as the current debate over competition, innovation, and antitrust. Analyzing famous examples of economic lock-in by dominant corporations of supposedly inferior products, this book makes the case that free markets in high technology industry deliver better products to consumers, at lower prices, without government intervention. This publication's careful scholarship, well-founded hypotheses, and refutations of previously accepted theories extending far beyond the Microsoft case make this publication a vital piece of understanding for the future of technology and economics.

.com In *Winners, Losers* Microsoft, two top economists punch some big holes in the government's antitrust case against the software behemoth. Stan J. Liebowitz and Stephen E. Margolis argue that government lawyers are dead wrong to say that consumers are being forced to accept inferior standards and high prices because of Microsoft's hegemony. With some well-documented and original research, the authors conclude that Microsoft is as successful as it is for a simple reason: good products win. "Whether they are lowly mousetraps or high-tech networks, better products prevail in the marketplace. People choose what they want, and what they want survives, at least for a while,"

they write. The authors also challenge the economists who believe that when it comes to technology, inferior standards get locked in because of unfair corporate actions or irrational consumer behavior. Through cogent analysis, Liebowitz and Margolis tear apart the two key examples used by these other economists: the VHS videocassette format and the so-called QWERTY typewriter keyboard layout. The authors argue that those formats dominate today because they truly were as good as, if not better than, their competitors, the Beta videocassette and Dvorak keyboard. While most of the book is theoretical and aimed toward those interested in public policy and economics, *Winners, Losers* Microsoft can also be an eye opener for anyone who wants to learn more about the antitrust case against the company. --Dan Ring "By a long way, it is the best single thing to read on this tangle of issues." *The Economist*