

## I'll Pay You Ten Bucks Not to Murder Me

Jason Brennan and Peter Jaworski<sup>1</sup>

A RESPONSE TO James Stacey Taylor (2016), “What Limits Should Markets Be Without?”, *Bus Ethics J Rev* 4(7): 41–46, <http://doi.org/10.12747/bejr2016.04.07>

### ABSTRACT

James Stacey Taylor offers three interpretations of our thesis, and argues that only one of them goes through. His point is to clarify our view rather than critique our position. In this brief response, we argue that, upon further clarification, we could endorse at least one of the other interpretations, though as Taylor notes, we don't need to for our book's thesis to go through.

**JAMES STACEY TAYLOR'S** (2016) “What Limits Should Markets Be Without?” is a helpful Commentary on our work on commodification (Brennan and Jaworski 2015a, 2015b).<sup>2</sup> In it, Taylor examines three interpretations of our main thesis, and finds that one of them is defensible while the other two are not.

We have argued that there are no “inherent” limits to markets, a thesis that we summarize as “If you may do it for free, you may do it for money.” There are things people should not buy and sell, such as

---

<sup>1</sup> Georgetown University (both). Email: [jason.brennan@georgetown.edu](mailto:jason.brennan@georgetown.edu), [peter.jaworski@georgetown.edu](mailto:peter.jaworski@georgetown.edu)

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter, parenthetical page references not otherwise attributed are to *Markets Without Limits* (Brennan and Jaworski 2015b).