

Do monopolies benefit or hurt the economy?

A monopoly hurts the economy as it doesn't allow for competition, prices can rise and people have no choice but to buy their products from one place. So there is still the same amount of money, but people are giving more to one establishment.

What should the role of governments be in controlling monopolies?

I believe that if the government sees one company becoming a monopoly, it should either place taxes on businesses that large, or give some kind of a boost to small businesses.

Should government try to encourage or curb competition among businesses?

It should encourage it, because while businesses are competing with each other, there is no incentive to raise prices too high, because people can just go to their competitors.

1. In a free society, what does Petro say the government should do?

In a free society, the government should keep the peace, jail lawbreakers and enforce contracts. It shouldn't step outside these bounds.

2. According to Petro, antitrust laws are consistent with the basic principles of the free society, private property, and freedom of contract. Support your answer.

False. Petro states that antitrust laws deprive persons of private property in some cases and outlaw certain contracts that would otherwise be valid. They have also allowed the biggest monopoly today, the unions, to grow and prosper.

3. According to Petro, one of the basic evils of antitrust laws is the vagueness and uncertainty of their application. Support your answer.

True. Petro says that the antitrust laws have mainly only produced uncertainty, preventing some people from forming monopolies but allowing others to.

4. What does Petro say is the most "abusive" and "socially dangerous" monopoly that exists today? From what does it result?

Petro says the most abusive monopoly is the unions, which force workers to pay their fees even if they aren't in the union, sometime physically assault non-union workers, and stop proper work from being done. They result from some strange oversights in the antitrust laws which have allowed them to grow enormous but haven't allowed others to do the same thing.

5. According to Petro, how does the government intervene using monopoly unionism?

Mark Twain showed how government-supported unions destroyed the honest trade that was working on a steamboat. By demanding that all non-unionized workers be fired, the union had placed itself in as the only source of pilots and workers for the steamboats. This would never have been allowed to happen if the government hadn't interfered and helped the unions.

6. What does Petro believe will happen when without the checks and balances of free men vying against free men in civilized competition?

There will be no safeguards against corruption, just as there will be shoplifting in a store with no guards or security devices. Unions would grow even more powerful.

7. What is the logical first step for those concerned about union power?

The logical first step would be to remove all the special privileges unions have been enjoying, and then let the system work itself out.

8. True or false. "The Free enterprise system is in itself fully capable of destroying all abusive restraints upon competition which are not supported and protected by government." Why?

True, because employers will be looking for the best people they get for the money they're paying, and unions will remain small because there will be people who don't want to join them and pay their dues.

9. What is the "moral" of Petro's article?

The moral seems to be that the antitrust laws are unconstitutional, unions are a dangerous monopoly, and that, if the government hadn't stepped in and messed everything up, we wouldn't have these problems.