Cite as: **Bus Ethics J Rev** 4(7): 41–46, http://doi.org/10.12747/bejr2016.04.07

## Business Ethics Journal Review Scholarly comments on ACADEMIC BUSINESS ETHICS businessethicsjournalreview.com

Edited by Chris MacDonald & Alexei Marcoux

ISSN: 2326-7526

## What Limits Should Markets be Without?

James Stacey Taylor<sup>1</sup>

A COMMENTARY ON Jason Brennan and Peter M. Jaworski (2016), *Markets Without Limits: Moral Virtues and Commercial Interests* (New York: Routledge)

## **ABSTRACT**

In *Markets Without Limits* Brennan and Jaworski defend the view that there are "no legitimate worries about what we buy, trade, and sell." But rather than being a unified defense of this position Brennan and Jaworski unwittingly offer *three* distinct pro-commodification views—two of which are subject to counterexamples. This Commentary will clarify what should be the thesis of their volume and identify the conditions that any counterexample to this must meet.

In *Markets Without Limits* Jason Brennan and Peter Jaworski defend the "pro-commodification" view that there are "no legitimate [moral] worries about what we buy, trade, and sell" provided that the items that are being bought, traded, and sold are items that it is morally legitimate for persons to possess (Brennan and Jaworski 2016: 7). This appears to be a straightforward – if provocative – thesis. But closer examination of *Markets Without Limits* reveals that rather than being a unified defense of one pro-commodification position Brennan and Jaworski (apparently unwittingly) defend *three* distinct pro-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The College of New Jersey. Email: jtaylor@tcnj.edu