| 1. | Record Nr. | UNINA9910311946803321 |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| | Autore | McKenzie Richard B |
| | Titolo | In defense of monopoly / Richard B. McKenzie and Dwight R. Lee |
| | Pubbl/distr/stampa | Ann Arbor, Michigan : , : University of Michigan Press, , [2008] ©2008 |
| | ISBN | 0-472-12628-8 0-472-90114-1 |
| | Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (xxi, 297 pages) : illustrations |
| | Altri autori (Persone) | LeeDwight R |
| | Disciplina | 338.8/2 |
| | Soggetti | Monopolies Production (Economic theory) |
| | Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| | Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| | Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| | Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references (pages 273-288) and index (pages 289-297). |
| | Nota di contenuto | ; Chapter 1. "The wretched spirit of monopoly" ; Chapter 2. Deadweight-loss monopoly ; Chapter 3. Monopoly as a coordination problem ; Chapter 4. Welfare-enhancing monopolies ; Chapter 5. Locked-in consumers ; Chapter 6. Monopoly prices and the client and bonding effects ; Chapter 7. The monopsony problem ; Chapter 8. The NCAA: a case study of the misuse of the monopsony and monopoly models ; Chapter 9. Monopoly as entrepreneurship ; Chapter 10. Property and monopoly ; Chapter 11. Summing up. |
| | Sommario/riassunto | In Defense of Monopoly offers an unconventional but empirically grounded argument in favor of market monopolies. Authors McKenzie and Lee claim that conventional, static models exaggerate the harm done by real-world monopolies, and they show why some degree of monopoly presence is necessary to maximize the improvement of human welfare over time. Inspired by Joseph Schumpeter's suggestion that market imperfections can drive an economy's long-term progress, In Defense of Monopoly defies conventional assumptions to show readers why an economic system's failure to efficiently allocate its resources is actually a necessary precondition for maximizing the system's long-term performance: the perfectly fluid, competitive economy idealized by most economists is decidedly inferior to one |