Murdering is Economically Efficient

For paper one, I want to write about the issue, “Can good people do bad things?” This involves the TV show Dexter and whether or not society is better off with or without certain groups of people such as sociopaths or any criminal for that matter. Certain issues that would be dealt with are; murder as a form of population control (maybe even thinning out the “less productive” persons in society), is an action truly evil if a person was raised with certain actions deemed socially acceptable by their parents (i.e. child molestation, murder, drugs), and is someone who kills a person that has committed a crime a bad thing?

These ideas cover a very broad range of directions that I can go with this paper. Dexter really opens up the possibilities on how an economist can view this situation. What exactly defines a pareto improvement for society as a whole? Are people even noticeably better off by one man killing other serial killers? Maybe the environment is better off with less people therefore the equilibrium amount of sociopath serial killers of serial killers is a lot higher than one would think, especially a non-economist. Is this even seen as a crime, or rather a lag-less form of capital punishment by a non-governmental agent?

The main restriction for making this society efficient is natural law and what has been deemed morally right and acceptable. This market failure may not seem to be a problem in the eyes of society’s eyes’ but to an economist, market equilibrium is far from being efficient. Many people are too caught up in moral dilemmas such as what is right and wrong be definition. However, an economist sees through the bullshit and if killing a killer helps out society and brings it closer to equilibrium, then so be it. This comes back to whether something is deemed acceptable(a right), or unacceptable(a wrong). There is a possibility society is closer to equilibrium with the amount of sociopaths and murderers in this world due to the fact of being under certain conditions. These conditions such as what is morally right and following certain laws just because they have been around for ever is such a “living inside the box” way of looking about things. Society is changing and even though the law may catch a certain amount of “bad” people, it is a very expensive process and often takes much time. Sending a criminal to jail cost a ridiculous amount of money. Who is to say what is right in today’s world?

The market equilibrium conditions need to be reevaluated and changed because what is wrong and what is right have transformed over hundreds of years since they have been in place. For example, abortion is now legal and if you can kill an unborn baby, why cant you kill someone who murders someone else.

Articles read:
Econ 4545- An introduction to market failures R
Econ 4545- Equity and efficiency defined and considered R
Dexter- I will watch all episodes to date. 1-4 so far
History of law—how the law hasn’t changed as much as society R
www.wchstv.com/newsroom/healthyforlife/1848.shtml - 47k a look into a criminal mind R

Other questions I need to take into consideration involve:
When will murder be morally acceptable?
http://www.freedomofmind.com/media/psychology-murder.htm
The effects on society of negative externalities
http://economics.fundamentalfinance.com/negative-externality.php
Psychology of a murderer, an eye for an eye
http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,943390,00.html

This topic deals mostly with society’s negative externalities and a balance between market equilibrium and moral hazard. Society will never be as good off as possible due to restrictions such as stupid issues like moral dilemmas, everyone being caught up in what is right, rather than what is efficient. I need to find more articles dealing with society’s response to dramatic moral issues and change. This paper examines the fine line of what is right and what is efficient without crossing that line. However, crossing that line may be required in the future due to other circumstances such as population control and the declining religious affiliation and no longer fearing “the wrath of God.” I really want to keep religion as much out of this paper if possible. It seems like there would be some correlation over time between religious denomination and certain crimes. The goal will be transforming society to think murder is not a “sin.”