



WINIR Workshop on Repugnant Behaviours

24-25 February 2021

University of Montpellier, Montpellier, France

Organiser: Alain Marciano

Important dates

15 June 2020 – Abstract submission deadline

15 July 2020 – Notification of acceptance

15 December 2020 – Full paper submission deadline

Keynote speaker

Kimberly D. Krawiec

Kathrine Robinson Everett Professor of Law
Duke Law School, USA

Formally introduced in economics by Nobel laureate Alvin Roth (2007), the concept of "**repugnance**" arises in the debate among philosophers and social scientists about **how and why moral concerns, taboos or sacred values place, or ought to place, limits on market transactions** (Anderson, 1990, 1993; Blevins et al., 2010; Cook & Krawiec, 2018; Elias, Laceteras & Macis, 2015, 2016; Etzioni, 1986, 1988; Healy & Krawiec, 2017; Kekes, 1998; Khalil & Marciano, 2018; Krawiec, 2015, 2016; Krawiec, Liu & Melcher, 2017; Kray et al., 2010; McGraw & Tetlock, 2005; Leider & Roth, 2010; McGraw, Schwartz & Tetlock, 2012; Sandel, 2012, 2013; Satz, 1995, 2008, 2012; Sen, 1987; Sheehan, 2016; Schoemaker & Tetlock, 2011).

One of the most important questions in this debate is **how repugnant behaviours should be dealt with, regulated or limited**. Some argue that repugnant behaviours should be punished by using fines rather than fees, because the former register moral disapproval, whereas the latter are simply prices that imply no moral judgment. This suggests that repugnant behaviors offend our

moral or ethical values. Yet examples often used to illustrate repugnant behaviours include selling babies (or other human beings) and organs, as well as prostitution and sometimes even pollution. Littering the Grand Canyon is also deemed to be repugnant. But can all these behaviours be put on the same footing? If not, how ought we distinguish between them? Is repugnance an absolute concept or a relative one? Does it change across cultures? Does this mean that the limits of markets differ from one culture to another? If so, are we really talking about repugnance? What alternative concepts might be useful?

These questions are **important from a philosophical, institutional and legal perspective**. Indeed, can we rely on the same mechanism to punish someone who sold their child and someone who threw a can into the Grand Canyon? Must we rely on law and **formal institutions** to punish repugnant behaviours? Which ones? When and how do we draw the limit between the behaviours that can be punished by formal rules and those that must be punished by **informal rules** (such as ostracism, shaming or even embarrassment)?

The purpose of the **WINIR Workshop on Repugnant Behaviours** is to bring together theoretical and applied papers from different disciplines, including economics, philosophy, law and political science, to discuss these and other related questions, thereby clarifying the concept of “repugnance” and improving our understanding of how to regulate repugnant behaviours.

A selection of the papers presented at the workshop will be included in a special issue currently being planned for publication in the fall of 2022.

Abstracts (400 words max.) or full papers should be sent to alain.marciano@umontpellier.fr.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E. (1990) “The Ethical Limitations of the Market” *Economics and Philosophy* 6(2): 179-205.
- Anderson, E. (1993) *Value in Ethics and Economics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Blevins, B., Ramirez, R. & Wight, J. B. (2010) “Ethics in the Mayan Marketplace” in M. D. White (ed.) *Accepting the Invisible Hand: Market-Based Approaches to Solving Social-Economic Problems* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Cook, P. J. & Krawiec, K. D. (2018) “If We Allow Football Players and Boxers to Be Paid for Entertaining the Public, Why Don’t We Allow Kidney Donors to Be Paid for Saving Lives?” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 81(3): 9-35.
- Elias, J. J., Lacetera, N. & Macis, M. (2015) “Sacred Values? The Effect of Information on Attitudes toward Payments for Human Organs” *American Economic Review* 105(5): 361-365.
- Elias, J. J., Lacetera, N. & Macis, M. (2016) “Efficiency-Morality Trade-Offs In Repugnant Transactions: A Choice Experiment” NBER, Working Paper No 22632.
- Etzioni, A. (1986) “The Case for a Multiple-Preference Conception” *Economics and Philosophy* 2: 159-183.
- Etzioni, A. (1988) *The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics* (New York: Free Press).

- Healy, K. & Krawiec, K. D. (2017) "Repugnance Management and Transactions in the Body" *American Economic Review* 107(5): 86-90.
- Held, P. J., McCormick, F., Ojo, A & Roberts, J. P. (2016) "A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Government Compensation of Kidney Donors" *American Journal of Transplantation* 16(3): 877-885.
- Kass L. R. (1997) "The Wisdom of Repugnance: Why We Should Ban the Cloning of Humans" *New Republic* 216(22):17-26.
- Kekes J. (1998) *A Case for Conservatism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Khalil, E. L. & Marciano, A. (2018) "A Theory of Tasteful and Distasteful Transactions" *Kyklos* 71(1): 110-131.
- Krawiec, K. D. (2015) "Markets, Morals and Limits in the Exchange of Human Eggs" *Georgetown Journal of Law & Public Policy* 13(1): 349-365.
- Krawiec, K. D. (2016) "Lessons from Law About Incomplete Commodification in the Egg Market" *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 33(2): 160-177.
- Krawiec, K. D., Liu, W. & Melcher, M. (2017) "Contract Development in a Matching Market: The Case of Kidney Exchange" *Law and Contemporary Problems* 80(1): 11-35.
- Kray, L. J., George, L. G., Liljenquist, K. A., Galinsky, A. D., Tetlock, P. E. & Roese, N. J. (2010) "From What Might Have Been to What Must Have Been: Counterfactual Thinking Creates Meaning" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 98(1): 106-118.
- Leider, S. & Roth, A. E. (2010) "Kidneys for Sale: Who Disapproves, and Why?" *American Journal of Transplantation* 10(5): 1221-1227.
- McGraw, P. & Tetlock, P. E. (2005) "Taboo Trade-Offs, Relational Framing And The Acceptability Of Exchanges" *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 15(1): 35-38.
- McGraw, P., Schwartz, J. & Tetlock, P. E. (2012) "From the Commercial to the Communal: Reframing Taboo Trade-Offs in Religious and Pharmaceutical Marketing" *Journal of Consumer Research* 39(1): 157-173.
- Roth, A. E. (2007) "Repugnance as a Constraint on Markets" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21(3): 37-58.
- Sandel, M. J. (2012) *What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux).
- Sandel, M. J. (2013) "Market Reasoning as Moral Reasoning: Why Economists Should Re-Engage With Political Philosophy" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27(4): 121-140.
- Satz, D. (1995) "Markets in Women's Sexual Labor" *Ethics* 106(1): 63-85.
- Satz, D. (2008) "The Moral Limits of Markets: The Case of Human Kidneys" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 108(1/pt3): 269-288.
- Satz, D. (2012) *Why Some Things Should Not Be For Sale: The Moral Limits of Markets* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Schoemaker, P. & Tetlock, P.E. (2011) "Taboo Scenarios: How To Think about The Unthinkable" *California Management Review* 54(2): 5-24.
- Sen, A. (1987) *On Ethics and Economics* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Sheehan, M. (2016) "The Role of Emotion in Ethics and Bioethics: Dealing with Repugnance and Disgust" *Journal of Medical Ethics* 42(1): 1-2.