

Chapter 1 : Competition (economics) - Wikipedia

The popular competition is set to take place on Sunday, Sept. 11, and it's sure to be a show full of, well, pageantry — all culminating with the current Miss America, Betty Cantrell, passing her.

It can be easy to lock in a static view of the economic world. Fortunately, things are looking up. This breath of fresh air is supplied by U. Assistant Attorney General Makan Delrahim. Delrahim is the first registered patent attorney to lead the Antitrust Division. Perhaps a patent practitioner background should be mandatory for high officials at this part of DOJ and on the Federal Trade Commission. In speeches since taking the helm at the Antitrust Division, Mr. Delrahim has described a more balanced, real-world-informed approach. Delrahim said at USC. Every incremental shift in bargaining leverage toward implementers of new technologies acting in concert can undermine incentives to innovate. I therefore view policy proposals with a one-sided focus on the hold-up issue with great skepticism because they can pose a serious threat to the innovative process. Delrahim expanded on the fact private property rights in patents and the free market facilitate adoption of new, better technology, which improves consumer welfare. The effect of such wrongheadedness threatens dynamic, innovation-spurred change in the competitive marketplace — a primary source of consumer benefit. The static-competition viewpoint also puts property rights and IP value at risk. Delrahim told his Penn audience. They convert a property rule into a liability rule, and amount to a troubling de facto compulsory licensing scheme. Again, its foundation is a dynamic competition model. Delrahim furthered the thought about dynamic competition. Delrahim seeks a similar rebalance and to correct the recent tilt against IP rights in the antitrust context. Rules that deprive a patent owner from exercising this right — or processes that dilute the meaning of this right — can undermine the underlying incentives to innovate. It is a perverse result indeed when the misapplication of the competition laws results in less innovation, less competition, and ultimately, fewer consumer choices. For example, Maureen Ohlhausen, a commissioner at the Federal Trade Commission, has voiced respect for strong IP rights within an antitrust context: And yet the FTC sees a competition problem when owners of standard-essential patents ask a court to enjoin unlicensed infringers. In doing so, the Commission wrongly heeded calls by technology users that want to pay the smallest possible royalties for their inputs. Ohlhausen, sounding similar themes, described dynamic competition to one audience: The competitive process not only drives our economy, it provides greater access, choice, quality, and other benefits for consumers. This is how static competition gets disrupted appropriately, by dynamic competition. To their credit, Mr. The Author James Edwards consults on intellectual property, health care innovation, and regulatory and policy issues. Edwards mentors start-ups and early-stage companies, largely in the med tech space, and is involved in several IP-centric projects. Edwards served as Legislative Director to Rep. House Judiciary Committee, and handled IP legislative matters. Edwards also worked on the staffs of Rep. Senate Judiciary Committee, and Sen. In addition, he was an association executive at the Healthcare Leadership Council. Edwards earned a Ph. The pages, articles and comments on IPWatchdog. Discuss this There are currently 2 Comments comments. Bemused June 10, A few months later, the Stupid Seven in the Oil States case quite clearly said that patents are not private property rights. Why are we getting such conflicting pronouncements and positions from this administration? Anon June 10,

Why is society so important? Does democracy lead to a competition of popular ideas (competition of populism), which could simply undermine the society? How important are morals in a healthy society?

September 10, by Dan Mitchell During the dark ages, nations like China were relatively advanced while Europeans were living in squalid huts. But that began to change several hundred years ago. Europe experienced the enlightenment and industrial revolution while the empires of Asia languished. What accounts for this dramatic shift? More specifically, governments were forced to adopt better policies because labor and capital had significant ability to cross borders in search of less oppression. You will see that the intellectual history of this issue is enormous, and the common theme is that big, centralized states hinder development. Remember that this table merely looks at the classical thinkers on the issue. The paper also includes modern thinkers, some of who are quoted below. And I also have a postscript that shows how many Nobel Prize-winning economists see jurisdictional competition as a tool for restraining excessive government. In Europe, the natural divisions form many medium-sized states in which the government of laws is not incompatible with the maintenance of the state; on the other hand, they are so favourable to this that without laws this state falls into decadence and becomes inferior to all the others. This is what has formed a genius for liberty, which makes it very difficult to subjugate each part and to put it under a foreign force other than by laws and by what is useful to its commerce. Princes have had to govern themselves more wisely than they themselves would have thought, for it turned out that great acts of authority were so clumsy that experience itself has made known that only goodness of government brings prosperity. In other words, the mobility of capital among jurisdictions limits government interference. The father of economics, Adam Smith, made a very similar point. The proprietor of stock is properly a citizen of the world and is not necessarily attached to any particular country. He would be apt to abandon the country in which he is exposed to a vexatious inquisition in order to be assessed a burdensome tax and would remove his stock to some country where he could either carry on his business or enjoy his fortune at ease. A tax that tended to drive away stock from a particular country would so far tend to dry up every source of revenue both to the sovereign and society. The nations, accordingly, who have attempted to tax the revenue arising from stock, instead of any severe inquisition have been obliged to content themselves with some very loose and, therefore, more or less arbitrary estimation. The abuses which sometimes creep into the local and provincial administration of a local or provincial revenue, however enormous so ever they may appear, are in reality, however, almost always very trifling in comparison with those which commonly take place in the administration and expenditure of the revenue of a great empire. Jacques Turgot Bastiat was not the only great French economist looked at the new nation of the United States and saw the benefits of jurisdictional competition. The asylum which the American people opens to the oppressed of all nations must console the earth. The ease with which it will now be possible to take advantage of this situation, and thus to escape from the consequences of a bad government, will oblige the European governments to be just and enlightened. And Immanuel Kant observed. This liberty, moreover, gradually advances further. Kant expanded on this notion in another publication. Thus, nature wisely separates the nations. By multiplying centres of government and discussion it promotes the diffusion of political knowledge and the maintenance of healthy and independent opinion. It is the protectorate of minorities and the consecration of self-government. The competitive struggle among the European nation states created the largest opportunities for modern western capitalism. The separate states had to compete for mobile capital, which dictated to them the conditions under which it would assist them to power. The power dispersed among the great proprietors was a check on them, as was the rising power of the market. Harold Berman of Harvard wrote. In the Western legal tradition diverse jurisdictions and diverse legal systems coexist and compete within the same community. It was also a source of freedom. Brian Tierny noted that rivalry between church and state also helped advance liberty. Not because national governments are good, but because competition between governments is the best protector of liberty and civilization. I favor tax competition, financial privacy, and fiscal sovereignty because these institutions lead to better tax policy. But

Vaubel teaches us that promotion of better tax policy is just the tip of the iceberg. Since this post is designed to show the intellectual case for jurisdictional rivalry, here are some quotes from a number of Nobel Prize-winning economists. Competition among communities offers not obstacles but opportunities to various communities to choose the type and scale of government functions they wish. Competition among national governments in the public services they provide and in the taxes they impose is every bit as productive as competition among individuals or enterprises in the goods and services they offer for sale and the prices at which they offer them. This is why international bureaucracies should not be allowed to create tax cartels, which benefit governments at the expense of the people. That is really the great strength of globalization –tending to force change on the part of the countries that have higher tax and also regulatory and other policies than some of the more innovative countries.

Chapter 3 : 53 Black History Month Writing Ideas â† Journal Buddies

Winning in sports competition has always enthralled competitors and spectators because it occurs in real time with uncertain outcomes. Unless rigged or cheated, athletic winning tests competitors in real unpredictable conditions.

Call now and save! Standard professional installation included. When looking for a television provider, it is important to compare a number of different features to find the best one for your home. Dish and cable providers in your area. Cable When looking for a television provider, it is important to compare a number of different features to find the best one for your home. The Genie contains more HD recording capacity than cable, so you can store up to hours of HD shows and movies. No matter what you love to watch, you can get more out of it when you watch it in HD. Dish and other providers. Dish and others, the HD winner is clear. Comcast Tired of not getting the service you want because of limited service areas and expensive cables that need to be connected to your home? Comcast is no competition. Nationwide availability â€” Satellite TV is available throughout all 50 states, which makes getting service and transferring it if you move seamless. You can now see Ultra-HD programming on full-time 4K channels. See original dramas, musical performances, movies and more on this exclusive channel. It will change the way you experience TV! Genie lets you record up to 5 shows at once and watch them at your convenience. Mobile apps Turn your smartphone or tablet into a convenient way to watch your favorite shows and movies. Stream live TV, or choose from the many available on demand titles. Comcast, Dish and other providers. Wanted the same prices that a new customer gets! Very friendly, helpful, and super excited about the product she was selling, as well as being an employee. She got me the best possible deal and was honest and knowledgeable! Thanks for answering all our questions and helping us with prompt answers.

Chapter 4 : Why DIRECTV? | | Learn Why It's The Best!

Abstract. Competition is the backbone of US economic policy. Competition advocacy is also thriving internationally. Promoting competition is broadly accepted as the best available tool for promoting consumer well-being.

Heather Cox Richardson After the Civil War, new industries brought Americans not just new products, but also more spending money and leisure time than any generation had ever had before. They bought nice clothing and novels, and went to the theater; their wives played lawn tennis and their children had ice cream to eat and toys to play with at newfangled parties given just for them on their birthday. Big business brought comfort and entertainment to many Americans, but it also brought grinding poverty to many others. Workers sweating near factory furnaces and entrepreneurs forced out of markets by monopolists resented the power of industrialists. By they focused their anger on the fact that American industry held its extraordinary position because it was protected by a law that kept foreign goods out of America. That law was called a tariff. Tariffs were essentially taxes on products coming into America. They meant that foreign goods could not compete with American products because, no matter how cheaply they could be produced, the addition of tariff fees to their selling costs would make them more expensive than American goods. Since American producers did not have to worry about foreign competition, the leaders in an industry could work together and set whatever prices they wished. People squeezed in the new economy resented the fact that tariffs kept prices artificially high. No one really knew what to do about the huge fortunes and great poverty of the post-Civil War years. When the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution, no one could envision those sorts of extremes of wealth. Many late 19th-century Americans urged government to stop industrialists from joining together to set the high prices that made them so rich. Others pointed out that the Constitution had given government no power to break combinations of businessmen. The Constitution did, though, give Congress the power to regulate the tariff. Foreign competition, they thought, would break the monopolies that American businessmen used to control the economy. For the rest of the century, the tariff was the central issue in American politics. Debates over the tariff were really fights over whether the government should protect business or workers when it developed economic policy. Republican congressmen backed a high tariff because they insisted that protecting business would guarantee a healthy economy in which workers could find jobs. After the war, the tariff became their signature issue. Republicans controlled every branch of the national government from to , but in that year, Democrats took control of the House of Representatives. For the rest of the century, they focused all their energy on staying in power so they could keep the tariff high. They insisted that, if elected, Democrats would destroy the economy by lowering tariffs. Republicans managed to protect their system of tariffs until , when Democratic President Woodrow Wilson and a Democratic Congress finally lowered the tariffs and replaced the lost revenue with taxes. But to people who lived after the Civil War, tariffs symbolized a much larger struggle between rich and poor, employers and workers, capital and labor. Tariffs were at the very heart of the questions raised by the new era of industry.

Chapter 5 : Point of the Game: Sports Ethics: Why is Winning So Important? Part I & II

So in this means securing your brand identity will help you claim penalties, if someone tries to use your brand identity. To secure your business identity, corporate identity Dubai is the best place.

Getting students to journal about these important topics is a great way to get them thinking critically about tough subjects and to help them examine their own beliefs. With these 53 new journal topics, during Black History Month students will consider the achievements of notable African Americans as well as the ramifications of racism in America. Some of the journal topics will push them to imagine life as a slave, while others will ask them to consider the outcomes of the Civil Rights movement. As your students enjoy writing about these Black History Month journal topics, they will gain a further understanding of what the month is all about. Questioning these important historical events will help students to appreciate the significance of African American roles in US history. I made a video about 25 Innovative Journaling Ideas for Kids. Is it important to have black history month, or should it be considered part of American history? Why has it taken America so long to have an African American president? Is there still racism in America? Why did it take the civil rights act so long to be passed? Frederick Douglass is an influential figure in American history becauseâ€¦ What would it have been like to be present for the emancipation proclamation speech? If you had been forced into slavery, would you have tried to escape? The civil rights movement changed the world becauseâ€¦ George Washington Carver is an important figure in history becauseâ€¦ The bonds between slaves and some sympathetic plantation hands wasâ€¦ If you lived during the civil war, which side would you have supported? Why do we celebrate Martin Luther King, Jr. If you had grown up as a slave, what would you do to take care of your family? Why did people support slavery? Is civil disobedience disobeying an unjust law ever acceptable? Martin Luther King, Jr. Some of the most important inventions that were created by African Americans areâ€¦ What can we learn from Harriet Jacobs? Why do people encourage diversity in schools and workplaces? How can we eliminate prejudice in the world? What it would have been like to go to a school that was forced to desegregate? Should there be laws for companies to hire a certain percentage of African Americans in order to make up for some of the damage caused by slavery? Abraham Lincoln was a revolutionary president becauseâ€¦ If I could ask Rosa Parks one question, I would want to knowâ€¦ Why is it important to have an entire month dedicated to remembering black history? If you were a slave that wanted to escape, how could you do it without being able to read or write? If you wanted to protest an unfair law to help other people, what would you do? The message of nonviolence taught by Martin Luther King, Jr. People should be treated equally becauseâ€¦ If you were a slave who managed to escape, what would you do once you got out? Why is Lincoln considered one of the most important presidents in us history? How could we eliminate racism in the world? Is it important for schools to be racially diverse? If Martin Luther King Jr. Was still alive today, he would thinkâ€¦ There are many more journaling prompts and journal topics on this site, and more coming soon!

Chapter 6 : Monthly Review | Monopoly and Competition in Twenty-First Century Capitalism

Revgear Competition League on Facebook. Latest Posts. Revgear World Open - Huntington Beach Podium Gallery; Revgear World Open - Huntington Beach Gallery 2;

The Ordoliberal, Austrian, Chicago, post-Chicago, Harvard, and Populist schools, for example, can disagree over how competition plays out in markets, the proper antitrust goals, and the legal standards to effectuate the goals. But they unabashedly agree that competition itself is good. Antitrust policies and enforcement priorities can change with incoming administrations. Some policies that ostensibly restrict competition are justified for promoting competition. Intellectual property rights, for example, can restrict competition along some dimensions such as the use of a trade name. But the belief is that intellectual property and antitrust policies, rather than conflict, complement one another in promoting innovation and competition. First, consumers can pay more for poorer quality products or services, and have fewer choices. Second, governmental or private restraints can raise exit costs and inhibit innovation. Competitors, challenged by new rivals or new forms of competition, may turn to regulators for help. Competitors may ask governmental agencies under the guise of consumer protection to prohibit or restrict certain pro-competitive activity, such as discounts to their clients. They may enlist the government to increase trade barriers or for other protectionist measures. Finally, impeding competition can cause significant anti-democratic outcomes, like concentrated economic and political power, political instability, and corruption. Competition sacrificed As the previous section discusses, competition, given its virtues, is the backbone of US economic policy. But competition, while often praised, is also criticized. Activity not subject to competition Life would be more stressful if we competed for everything. Competition cannot always be preferred over cooperation. Cooperation is often more appealing and socially rewarding. Commuting to work, in theory, is not a competitive sport. Parents should not foster competition among their children for their affection. Nor do the mainstream religions endorse a deity who wants people to compete for His love. Antitrust norms do not translate easily in these social or religious settings. One example is human organs. Markets once considered repugnant eg lending money for interest, life insurance for adults are no longer. Markets that are repugnant today eg slavery , once were not. Antitrust immunities The US antitrust laws apply across most industries and to nearly all forms of business organizations. But the Court noted: Surely it cannot be said that competition is of itself a national policy. To do so would disregard not only those areas of economic activity so long committed to government monopoly as no longer to be thought open to competition, such as the post office, cf. It would most strikingly disregard areas where policy has shifted from one of prohibiting restraints on competition to one of providing relief from the rigors of competition, as has been true of railroads. But Sherman did not see: Such an association is not in any sense a combination arrangement made to interfere with interstate commerce. Just as athletic contests distinguish between fair and foul play, the law distinguishes between fair and unfair methods of competition. As one treatise observed: The law of unfair competition has developed as a kind of Marquis of Queensbury code for competitive infighting. The antitrust community would debate over what constitutes fair and unfair methods of competition, but agree that not all methods of competition are desirable. The community would likely tolerate price and service regulations in some industries eg natural monopolies where competition is not feasible. As one American court observed: The Sherman Act, embodying as it does a preference for competition, has been since its enactment almost an economic constitution for our complex national economy. A fair approach in the accommodation between the seemingly disparate goals of regulation and competition should be to assume that competition, and thus antitrust law, does operate unless clearly displaced. The dark side of competition In condemning private and public anti-competitive restraints, competition officials and courts invariably prescribe competition as the cure. But that is a function of market conditions, not competition itself. Competition itself cannot cause market failures. Economist Irving Fisher over a century ago examined two assumptions of any laissez-faire doctrine: In the past decade, the economic literature has identified several scenarios where the problem is not too little competition, or concerns over unfair methods of competition, but the suboptimal effects from competition itself. Behavioral exploitation Competition policy typically assumes

that market participants can best judge what subserves their interests. Suboptimal competition can arise when firms compete in fostering and exploiting demand-driven biases or imperfect willpower. To illustrate, suppose many consumers share certain biases and limited willpower. Competition benefits society when firms compete to help consumers obtain or find solutions for their bounded rationality and willpower. Providing this information is another facet of competition—trust us, we will not exploit you. Some consumers do not understand the complex, opaque ways late fees and interest rates are calculated, and are overoptimistic on their ability and willpower to timely pay off the credit card purchases. Alternatively, the debiased consumers do not remain with the helpful credit card company. Instead they switch to the remaining exploiting credit card firms, where they, along with the other sophisticated customers, benefit from the exploitation such as getting airline miles for their purchases, while not incurring any late fees. This problem, of course, can arise under oligopolies or monopolies. But here entry and greater competition, as one recent survey found, can worsen, rather than improve, the situation: The most striking result of the literature so far is that increasing competition through fostering entry of more firms may not on its own always improve outcomes for consumers. Indeed competition may not help when there are at least some consumers who do not search properly or have difficulties judging quality and prices. In the presence of such consumers it is no longer clear that firms necessarily have an incentive to compete by offering better deals. Rather, they can focus on exploiting biased consumers who are very likely to purchase from them regardless of price and quality. The incentives to engage in such activities become more intense when there are more competitors. Second, after identifying these consumers, firms must be able to exploit them. But firms, like consumers, are also susceptible to biases and heuristics. In competitive settings—such as auctions and bidding wars—overconfidence and passion may trump reason, leading participants to overpay for the purchased assets. If repeated biased decision-making is not punished, the problem is too little, rather than too much, competition. Given the cost of losing, it is also illogical to enter a bidding war. But if everyone believes this, no one bids—also illogical. If only one person bids, that person gets a bargain. Once multiple bidders emerge, the second highest bidder fears having to pay and escalates the commitment. Competitors A and B, in their example, fear being competitively disadvantaged if the other acquires cheaply Company C, a key supplier or buyer. Firms A and B may rationally decide to enter the bidding contest. Both are better off if the other cannot acquire Company C, nonetheless neither can afford the other to acquire the firm. If they both know they cannot acquire Company C under the antitrust laws, neither will bid. Antitrust, while not always preventing the competitive escalation paradigm, can prevent overbidding in highly concentrated industries where market forces cannot punish firms that overbid. When individual and group interests diverge Suppose the first assumption Fisher identifies is satisfied—people aptly judge what serves their interest, which leads them to maximize their well-being. One avoids the problem of behavioral exploitation and perhaps the competitive escalation paradigm. Competition benefits society when individual and group interests and incentives are aligned or at least do not conflict. Difficulties arise when individual interests and group interests diverge. As Darwin saw clearly, the fact that unfettered competition in nature often fails to promote the common good has nothing to do with monopoly exploitation. Hockey players prefer wearing helmets. But to secure a relative competitive advantage, one player chooses to play without a helmet. The other players follow. None now have a competitive advantage from playing helmetless. Collectively the hockey players are worse off. They and society are collectively worse off. How individual and group interests can diverge when firms lobby for a relative competitive advantage Today corporations and trade groups spend billions of dollars lobbying the federal and state governments. Microsoft now spends millions of dollars annually on lobbying. In this transactional spirit, some corporations have affirmatively urged Congress to place limits on their electioneering communications. These corporations fear that officeholders will shake them down for supportive ads, that they will have to spend increasing sums on elections in an ever-escalating arms race with their competitors, and that public trust in business will be eroded. It can impose a kind of implicit tax. When presented with a list of possibly questionable actions that may help the business survive, 47 per cent of CFOs felt one or more could be justified in an economic downturn. While 46 per cent of total respondents agree that company management is likely to cut corners to meet targets, CFOs have an even more pessimistic view 52 per cent. Other firms, given the cost disadvantage,

face competitive pressure to follow; such competition collectively leaves the firms and society worse off. But under a shared value worldview, these concepts are reinforcing. How individual and group interests can diverge when financial institutions undertake additional risk for a relative competitive advantage The conflict between collective and individual interests arose in the financial crisis. Banks, the OECD described, are prone to take substantial risks: Second, the wide dispersion of bank debt among small, uninformed and often fully insured investors prevents any effective discipline on banks from the side of depositors. Thus, because banks can behave less prudently without being easily detected or being forced to pay additional funding costs, they have stronger incentives to take risk than firms in other industries. Examples of fraud and excessive risk are numerous in the history of financial systems as the current crisis has also shown. Even for rational-choice theorists like Richard Posner, the government must be a countervailing force to such self-interested rational private behavior by better regulating financial institutions. The remedy is neither monopoly nor overregulation which besides impeding competition, stifles innovation and renders the financial system inefficient or unprofitable. The FTC in Ethyl described this divergence:

Chapter 7 : SFP: Why is "Self-Control" So Important, and How Can It Be Improved?

When one carefully targets its marketing mix, it is less likely to face direct competition so superior customer value is achieved with benefits provided by the whole marketing mix rather than just relying simply on price.

Zeno rescinded all previously granted exclusive rights. Under Henry III an act was passed in [17] to fix bread and ale prices in correspondence with grain prices laid down by the assizes. Penalties for breach included amercements, pillory and tumbrel. On top of existing penalties, the statute stated that overcharging merchants must pay the injured party double the sum he received, an idea that has been replicated in punitive treble damages under US antitrust law. Also under Edward III, the following statutory provision outlawed trade combination. In continental Europe, competition principles developed in *lex mercatoria*. In , Henry VIII of England reintroduced tariffs for foodstuffs, designed to stabilize prices, in the face of fluctuations in supply from overseas. So the legislation read here that whereas, it is very hard and difficult to put certain prices to any such things The privileges conferred were not abolished until the Municipal Corporations Act Early competition law in Europe[edit] Judge Coke in the 17th century thought that general restraints on trade were unreasonable. The English common law of restraint of trade is the direct predecessor to modern competition law later developed in the US. A dyer had given a bond not to exercise his trade in the same town as the plaintiff for six months but the plaintiff had promised nothing in return. Europe around the 16th century was changing quickly. The new world had just been opened up, overseas trade and plunder was pouring wealth through the international economy and attitudes among businessmen were shifting. In a system of Industrial Monopoly Licenses, similar to modern patents had been introduced into England. But by the reign of Queen Elizabeth I , the system was reputedly much abused and used merely to preserve privileges, encouraging nothing new in the way of innovation or manufacture. The statute followed the unanimous decision in *Darcy v. The court found the grant void and that three characteristics of monopoly were 1 price increases, 2 quality decrease, 3 the tendency to reduce artificers to idleness and beggary. This put an end to granted monopolies until King James I began to grant them again. In Parliament passed the Statute of Monopolies , which for the most part excluded patent rights from its prohibitions, as well as guilds. Sandys it was decided that exclusive rights to trade only outside the realm were legitimate, on the grounds that only large and powerful concerns could trade in the conditions prevailing overseas. At the same time industrialisation replaced the individual artisan , or group of artisans, with paid labourers and machine-based production. Commercial success increasingly dependent on maximising production while minimising cost. Therefore, the size of a company became increasingly important, and a number of European countries responded by enacting laws to regulate large companies which restricted trade. Following the French Revolution in the law of 14"17 June declared agreements by members of the same trade that fixed the price of an industry or labour as void, unconstitutional, and hostile to liberty. Similarly the Austrian Penal Code of established that "agreements Austria passed a law in abolishing the penalties, though such agreements remained void. However, in Germany laws clearly validated agreements between firms to raise prices. Throughout the 18th and 19th century, ideas that dominant private companies or legal monopolies could excessively restrict trade were further developed in Europe. However, as in the late 19th century, a depression spread through Europe, known as the Panic of , ideas of competition lost favour, and it was felt that companies had to co-operate by forming cartels to withstand huge pressures on prices and profits. The Act for the Prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade was passed one year before the United States enacted the most famous legal statute on competition law, the Sherman Act of It was named after Senator John Sherman who argued that the Act "does not announce a new principle of law, but applies old and well recognised principles of common law. United States antitrust law Senatorial Round House by Thomas Nast , The Sherman Act of attempted to outlaw the restriction of competition by large companies, who co-operated with rivals to fix outputs, prices and market shares, initially through pools and later through trusts. Trusts first appeared in the US railroads, where the capital requirement of railroad construction precluded competitive services in then scarcely settled territories. This trust allowed railroads to discriminate on rates imposed and services provided*

to consumers and businesses and to destroy potential competitors. Different trusts could be dominant in different industries. The Standard Oil Company trust in the 1880s controlled a number of markets, including the market in fuel oil, lead and whiskey. A primary concern of this act is that competitive markets themselves should provide the primary regulation of prices, outputs, interests and profits. Instead, the Act outlawed anticompetitive practices, codifying the common law restraint of trade doctrine. Since the enactment of the Sherman Act enforcement of competition law has been based on various economic theories adopted by Government. Following the enactment in US court applies these principles to business and markets. Courts applied the Act without consistent economic analysis until 1911, when it was complemented by the Clayton Act which specifically prohibited exclusive dealing agreements, particularly tying agreements and interlocking directorates, and mergers achieved by purchasing stock. From onwards the rule of reason analysis was frequently applied by courts to competition cases. However, the period was characterized by the lack of competition law enforcement. Since game theory has frequently been used in anti-trust cases. European Union competition law Competition law gained new recognition in Europe in the inter-war years, with Germany enacting its first anti-cartel law in 1919 and Sweden and Norway adopting similar laws in 1920 and 1921 respectively. However, with the Great Depression of competition law disappeared from Europe and was revived following the Second World War when the United Kingdom and Germany, following pressure from the United States, became the first European countries to adopt fully fledged competition laws. The agreement aimed to prevent Germany from re-establishing dominance in the production of coal and steel as it was felt that this dominance had contributed to the outbreak of the war. Article 65 of the agreement banned cartels and article 66 made provisions for concentrations, or mergers, and the abuse of a dominant position by companies. The Treaty of Rome established the enactment of competition law as one of the main aims of the EEC through the "institution of a system ensuring that competition in the common market is not distorted. The treaty also established principles on competition law for member states, with article 90 covering public undertakings, and article 92 making provisions on state aid. Regulations on mergers were not included as member states could not establish consensus on the issue at the time. According to Article 2 any such agreements are automatically void. Article 3 establishes exemptions, if the collusion is for distributional or technological innovation, gives consumers a "fair share" of the benefit and does not include unreasonable restraints that risk eliminating competition anywhere or compliant with the general principle of European Union law of proportionality. Article prohibits the abuse of dominant position, [37] such as price discrimination and exclusive dealing. Article lays down a general rule that the state may not aid or subsidize private parties in distortion of free competition and provides exemptions for charities, regional development objectives and in the event of a natural disaster. The Competition Act, and Competition Commission of India India responded positively by opening up its economy by removing controls during the Economic liberalisation. As a result, Indian market faces competition from within and outside the country. But after the economic reforms in 1991, this legislation was found to be obsolete in many aspects and as a result, a new competition law in the form of the Competition Act, was enacted in 2002. The Competition Commission of India, is the quasi judicial body established for enforcing provisions of the Competition Act. In Korea and Japan, the competition law prevents certain forms of conglomerates. In addition, competition law has promoted fairness in China and Indonesia as well as international integration in Vietnam. While there remains differences between regimes for example, over merger control notification rules, or leniency policies for whistle-blowers, [45] and it is unlikely that there will be a supranational competition authority for ASEAN akin to the European Union, [46] there is a clear trend towards increase in infringement investigations or decisions on cartel enforcement. World Trade Organization and International Competition Network There is considerable controversy among WTO members, in green, whether competition law should form part of the agreements At a national level competition law is enforced through competition authorities, as well as private enforcement. The United States Supreme Court explained: This system depends on strong competition for its health and vigor, and strong competition depends, in turn, on compliance with antitrust legislation. In enacting these laws, Congress had many means at its disposal to penalize violators. It could have, for example, required violators to compensate federal, state, and local governments for the estimated damage to their respective economies caused by the

violations. But, this remedy was not selected. Instead, Congress chose to permit all persons to sue to recover three times their actual damages every time they were injured in their business or property by an antitrust violation. This was done to facilitate quicker resolution of competition-related inquiries. In the Commission issued a Green Paper on Damages actions for the breach of the EC antitrust rules, [50] which suggested ways of making private damages claims against cartels easier. As analysed by Professor Whelan, these types of sanctions engender a number of significant theoretical, legal and practical challenges. Office of Fair Trading Director and Professor Richard Whish wrote sceptically that it "seems unlikely at the current stage of its development that the WTO will metamorphose into a global competition authority. While it is incapable of enforcement itself, the newly established International Competition Network [56] ICN is a way for national authorities to coordinate their own enforcement activities.

Chapter 8 : Competition law - Wikipedia

Miss America: A History. In the summer of , on the boardwalk of Atlantic City, an American icon was born. For the past 97 years, Miss America has been one of the country's most recognizable household names and has been at the center of everything from national trends to social movements to the birth of television.

Journaling encourages students to examine ideas in new ways, and students will come to a deeper understanding of the challenges that women have faced throughout history. In these 50 new journal prompts, students will consider everything from the most influential women they know to their own perceptions about men and women. How does she inspire you? Do you think women have equal rights to men today? Why or why not? Why do we need a special month to honor women? What types of stereotypes do people have about women? Why can stereotyping be dangerous? List three important qualities women should have and three important qualities that men should have. Were the traits you listed different for men and women? What can you learn by examining these differences? Why is it important for women to contribute to these fields? Do you think men and women are naturally different from one another? What are some of the biggest challenges that women face today? How will these change in the next 20 years? Research a woman who was the first female to work in a traditionally male field. What kind of struggles do you think she faced? Why is it hard for women to gain access to jobs and communities that are traditionally male? How will others in the field perceive her? What are some important gains women have made throughout history? Which achievement made by feminists are you most thankful for? When do you think America will have its first female president? Eleanor Roosevelt once said: How can you use it to inspire your own actions? Who is your favorite historical female figure? What do you admire about her? Think of your favorite television show. How are the female characters different from the male characters? Do you think that the characters in popular media accurately represent women? Why is it important for both women and men to be well-rounded in a number of different fields and traits? List three professions that are traditionally occupied by men. Are these jobs becoming more gender-neutral today? List three professions that are traditionally occupied by women. How is it harmful to women and men to link these jobs to gender? Why do you think there are more male politicians than female politicians? The Equal Pay Act was signed in , when women earned just 59 cents to every dollar that men earned. Today, women earn about 78 cents to every dollar that men earn. Why do you think it is taking so long to close the pay gap? How can we close it more quickly? Why have women been traditionally expected to handle all domestic chores? Who cooks, cleans, does laundry, etc. Does this situation work for your family? Why do you think women have often not been allowed to vote throughout history? Write a story about a powerful female world leader. What is her life like? Do people expect her to act in a certain way? Did you try it anyway? How did you feel? Has the feminist movement succeeded? Write about something that people could do to prevent discrimination against women. How can language be discriminatory? What are some ways you can use words to make your speech more gender-neutral? Do you consider yourself to be a feminist? Does the world need more feminists? What other groups can women work with to promote equality in our world? Where are there other opportunities to end discrimination? What are some important contributions women have made to our world? Imagine yourself as a woman living during the suffrage era. What would your life be like? List three famous women and three famous men that you respect. Next, think about their professions and roles. Were there any differences in the types of people you chose? Why is the right to vote so important? What effects are caused by denying this right to a particular group of people? What do these titles say about our perceptions of women and the types of jobs they can hold? Mae Jemison, the first black woman to travel in space, once said: If you could meet any influential woman, whom would you choose? What questions would you ask her? Why is it important to look back at history from a female perspective? How is it different from the way we typically look at history? What traits do the women in your family share? How have they informed your opinions of what women should be like? Write a letter to an influential woman in your life and let her know that she has made an impact on you. How do you think the fight for gender equality will change over the next years? Will we ever attain true equality? Until next time, write on!

In economics, competition is a condition where different economic firms seek to obtain a share of a limited good by varying the elements of the marketing mix: price, product, promotion and place.

Why is Winning So Important? Elite athletes, however, proclaim that the challenge to win drives them to excel and improve. This paradox of the drive to win helps explain the complex motivation around winning that drives excellence but tips over into cheating and dirty play. The sports world is full of stories and myths and legends for whom one motto dominates. The designation of winning generates metrics that permit the athletes, spectators and judges to understand transparently whom wins. The power of the metrics lies in the shared assumption that they measure something valuable. This value shapes the skills, knowledge, training and commitment that athletes and coaches invest in trying to win. The metrics and logic of achieving them mold the behavior and excellences of athletes who commit to mastering and winning under these rubrics. The etymology of win hints at the depths of the idea. The word emphasizes striving and contending against not just others but nature or challenges thrown by life. Win applied to all aspects of life but mainly property. Winning came late to sports and was not applied in German or English until mid nineteenth century. The Germanic concept of winning matches the Greek roots for athlete. Athletes contest each other. The contest requires striving and sacrificing to achieve a goal. Both emphasize achieving ends that require effort and often pain or suffering to achieve an end. Winning in both traditions converges upon the notion of work, sacrifice, struggle to achieve a success. The ideal of winning focuses the motivation and training of individuals who pursue athletic goals. In this train of thought winning becomes the marker of success in an endeavor. It fits with the deeper meaning of effort and striving to gain an end. Winning creates a public and transparent way to test oneself against others in seeking a goal. The metrics can measure points scored against each other; they can measure sheer speed at a fixed task such as running or swimming. The distance in throwing or jumping might gauge the best. The crucial point to remember is all these metrics are artificial and linked to a ritualized game with rules—the definition of winning is ultimately arbitrary in sports. Yet even with its arbitrary parameter and artificial aspects, winning engrosses fans and players alike because of its potential for clarity of outcome. People and competitors know who wins at the end of competition. Winning as striving ends with clarity and measuring across opponents and competitors. Winning in sports competition has always enthralled competitors and spectators because it occurs in real time with uncertain outcomes. Unless rigged or cheated, athletic winning tests competitors in real unpredictable conditions. The testing challenges people in unique ways under uncertainty and calls forth maximum and smart effort to win. Upsets can occur, favorites can lose, people can get better over time and once lowly players can become masters. The risk resonates with life in the way a written show or other scripted entertainment cannot provide. Testing oneself against others illustrates how the process of striving to win can bring out some of the best of athletics. Athletes who love their sport express excellence by pushing themselves to their mental, physical and emotional limits. Pushing to the limits and mastering higher levels of achievement engenders deep fulfillment and self-respect. This respect and fulfillment provide the deep intrinsic joy of integrated mental, emotional and physical achievement that they first knew as children expressing their physical qualities. The athlete originally competes against baselines, against ideals of form and against themselves to stretch and extend their reach and competence. Athletes often work alone especially in the beginning as they discover their love and talent for a sport. This path does not necessarily require the need or desire to dominate or vanquish others. Winning can then be a means and motivation to progress and grow in these domains. Individuals and teams test their expertise against others; winning or losing a competition identifies where their achievement stands relative to others at a similar level of stature. The press and test and drive to excel and demonstrate this in winning matches an intrinsic drive and appreciation with an extrinsic reward from the prize and approbation and stature of winning. A winning athlete can know the quiet satisfaction of being the best if only for a moment. The intrinsic satisfaction of expressive excellence can be joined by the joy of experiencing, as a fan or athlete, the beauty and delight in significant athletic excellence. Fans can appreciate the sheer beauty and technical virtuosity of athletes in competition.

This involves not just technical appreciation but realizing the combination of strength, intensity and technique involved in physically tense competition where bodies and teams collide with each other. Players, coaches and spectators can all enjoy this. One of the ironies of winning as athletic obsession lies in the fact that the best athlete or athletes do not always win. Sometimes luck plays a part as the Greeks and Romans knew with Fortuna. Sometimes the coordination or plan of a team will permit the less talented athletes to win over a more talented but less unified team. While the best athlete and best team in a technical sense of consistent superb manifestation of the skills of the sport can converge with winning, this is not a necessary convergence. The best can lose and this is one aspect of the allure and often tragedy of sport. Many great athletes never end up winning championships because they compete on teams that fail. This accounts for the often criticized but perfectly understandable desire for great athletes on losing teams to use free agency or the market to end up with a winning team and have a chance to not only be great but win a championship. This paradox that the best athlete does not always win creates a broader motivational opening for many athletes. It permits individuals and teams to deploy intelligence, collaboration and work ethic to overcome talent limits. Winning, however, can take on a more ethically dangerous cast of motivation. Winning not only determines which person or team is better on a particular day and contest; it can metamorphose into exultation and domination. Again the roots of this can be deep. In the classical world the origins of play and athletic competition arose from their link to battle and war. In the contest of war, the outcomes are brutal and final. In classical times the losers were killed or sold into slavery. Their homes were conquered, their families taken as slaves or killed; their land taken or defiled. The game of war was played for mortal stakes. And the practice for war as exemplified in athletic competition reflected those brutal and naked stakes. Winning wars and winning athletic competition become forms of domination. An athlete who carries over this mind set revels not just in their achievement but in the downfall of their opponents. They revel not just in their distinction but in the loss and humiliation of their opponent. The psychological matrix of winning becomes more extrinsic and mean spirited linked to its origins in war. This relation to winning as validation for worth reduces to: I beat them therefore I am. If I lose, I am worthless. The driver here lies in the external vulnerability of the motivation and the ultimately limited or even hollow satisfaction. Seeking to win as domination is intensified in two ways. First many individuals or teams represent communities. Their team is linked to a city or country as in the Olympics or World championships. This communal connection gives a patriotic gloss and increases the emotional stakes and investment for not just the team—often they may just be a collection of professionals gathered together for a season of competition—but to the fans who fanatically follow them. The followers invest their own identity and gain joy or sorrow at the wins and losses of the teams. Fanatic followers may mark their life events by losses, wins and championships of their teams. Teams entwine with personal and communal histories. College sports in America along with deep local and national ties to professional teams all reflect this. This loyalty can blow up into violence or feigned even real dislike against other communities or teams. Some coaches thrive in demonizing other teams; something most professionals resist since they may end up playing for those teams at some point in their career. This communal aspects links to cities, nations and colleges spreads an aura of emotional dynamism around team games and seasons and championships. Owners add another variable to obsession with winning in professional sports. The game at its highest levels in countries across the world has become a game of billionaires or corporations. These ultra-rich individuals do not buy teams just for fun; but there is an immense amount of ego satisfaction and celebrity to team ownership. The owners, many of whom are very successful business people or corporations, expect a return. They want a profit in money but above all in psychic return. Both profits arise from winning. Winning fills the stands and gets media contracts and creates high-sustained revenue streams. Winning increases their profile in the community where the team lives. The owner becomes a celebrity and benefactor who can be lionized and is heroic; the downside is that the owners can be vilified if they sponsor a consistent loser. This vilification can drive owners to focus obsessively upon winning. This obsession can play out in high expectations, very short time lines for coaches and players, and this pushes coaches and players to search for edges to win and keep their jobs and keep their owners happy. This passion to win or dominate and share in the extrinsic glory can obsess owners and fixate fans around teams. Here you can end up with coaches illegally filming practices or

putting up bounties to players who injure other players. Here you find coaches condoning or looking the other way when players use illegal performance enhancing drugs to get an edge or keep their job a little longer. The game and the opponents remain essential to the very activity itself and the sole focus on winning misses this wide and critical aspect of athletic respect and success.