

Editor's Note

The focus of this issue is a symposium on James Stacey Taylor's recent book: *Markets with Limits: How the Commodification of Academia Derails Debate*. This book is in large part a response to Jason Brennan and Peter Jaworski's 2016 book: *Markets without Limits: Moral Virtues and Commercial Interests*. Brennan and Jaworski's book is a clear philosophical defense of the claim that there are no inherent moral limits to markets, as they put it: "if you may do it for free, then you may do it for money" (10). The book made something of a splash: both for its arguments and the provocative marketing of the book through the use of selling dedication and acknowledgement sponsorships. It remains an important book that brings focus to how to respond to certain kinds of criticisms of markets and commercial activity.

When I heard that Taylor was coming out with a book criticizing Brennan and Jaworski, I was intrigued. I knew of Taylor's work defending organ markets, so I was curious what his criticisms of Brennan and Jaworski would be. There seemed to be a shared agreement on markets as being morally important for human life and so I was expecting a friendly and academic exchange of subtle differences of opinion on how best to make sense of the role and morality of markets. It quickly became apparent that the differences between these authors had many more dimensions to it than I was anticipating. This is not the appropriate forum to get into those aspects but, as the editor, I think it is important to note that Brennan and Jaworski were invited to participate in the symposium. They declined and their reasons are discussed, in general, elsewhere (the Facebook pages of each explain their reasons, in general, for not responding in any detail to Taylor's book).

The authors here do not take up the main issues of contention between Taylor and Brennan and Jaworski, but instead focus on implications of Taylor's arguments about market and academic norms. Jeffrey Carroll considers arguments about who has the responsibility for preventing errors from appearing (and spreading) in academic literature. He then suggests some ways of shifting incentives to help prevent such errors.

Jeppe von Platz takes aim at Taylor's argument for the supremacy of academic norms over market norms for governing the research of academics. Von Platz argues that despite Taylor's argument about research quality, market norms might still be better at producing better overall advances in human understanding.

Chad Van Schoelandt argues that schemata and perspectives play important roles in how we understand, evaluate, and make sense of arguments. He suggests that shifting or abandoning one's schema might be more relevant for making sense of the kinds of outcomes Taylor is trying to explain through the dynamic of academic and market norms.

And lastly, Taylor responds to these various criticisms and arguments in his contribution to the symposium.

The issue ends with a reviews by Eric Daniels of Richard Salsman's *Where Have All the Capitalists Gone* and a review by Kathleen Touchstone of Edward Younkin's *Exploring Atlas Shrugged: Ayn Rand's Magnum Opus*.

Before closing out this note, *Reason Papers* is looking to expand its editorial staff. We are looking for two or three Associate Editors to join a newly formed editorial board. The primary task of the Associate Editor will be to organize and edit symposiums for the journal. Please see our website for more information about what we are looking for and how to apply. (There is no compensation for this position.)

Shawn E. Klein

Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

www.reasonpapers.com