

2015

# Legal Realism and Legal Doctrine

Brian Leiter

Follow this and additional works at: [http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/  
public\\_law\\_and\\_legal\\_theory](http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/public_law_and_legal_theory)

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Brian Leiter, "Legal Realism and Legal Doctrine," University of Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Working Paper, No. 528 (2015).

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Working Papers at Chicago Unbound. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public Law and Legal Theory Working Papers by an authorized administrator of Chicago Unbound. For more information, please contact [unbound@law.uchicago.edu](mailto:unbound@law.uchicago.edu).

# CHICAGO

PUBLIC LAW AND LEGAL THEORY WORKING PAPER NO. 528



## LEGAL REALISM AND LEGAL DOCTRINE

*Brian Leiter*

THE LAW SCHOOL  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

April 2015

This paper can be downloaded without charge at the Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper Series:  
<http://www.law.uchicago.edu/academics/publiclaw/index.html>  
and The Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection.

LEGAL REALISM AND LEGAL DOCTRINE

Brian Leiter\*  
January 27, 2015

The American Legal Realists<sup>1</sup> did not reject doctrine, because they did not reject the idea that judges decide cases in accordance with normative standards of some kind: “doctrine” after all is just a normative standard about what should be done, but one formulated and made explicit by a statute or a court or a treatise. A judge who decides cases based on the norm “this breach of contract is efficient” still decides based on a normative standard, even if it is not one that the law necessarily endorses. But the non-legal normative standards of yesterday can become the legally binding norms of tomorrow. What the Legal Realists taught us is that too often the doctrine that courts invoke is not really the normative standard upon which they *really* rely. And it was central to Legal Realism to reform the law to make the actual doctrine cited by courts and treatise writers correspond to the *actual* normative standards upon which judges rely. Doctrine remains so important today, as many of the contributions to this symposium show, precisely because the realist law reform movement was successful in so many arenas.

All these points were driven home to me almost twenty years ago when I was teaching at the University of Texas and had the opportunity to talk at some length with my colleague, the late great Charles Alan Wright, then the President of the American Law Institute (ALI) and the

---

\* Karl N. Llewellyn Professor of Jurisprudence and Director of the Center for Law, Philosophy, & Human Values, University of Chicago. I am grateful to Ed Rock and Shyam Balganesch for their interest in my work on legal realism, for the idea for this excellent symposium, and for inviting me to participate. Finally, thanks once again to Phil Smoke, University of Chicago Law School Class of 2015, for excellent research assistance.

<sup>1</sup> I shall refer hereafter simply to “Legal Realists.” On the profound differences between the Americans and the Scandinavian Legal Realists, see Brian Leiter, *Legal Realisms, Old and New*, 47 VAL. U. L. REV. 67 (2013).

senior author of perhaps the most important and influential treatise in American law of the past half-century, *Federal Practice and Procedure*.<sup>2</sup> Wright seemed a quintessential “doctrinalist,” perhaps the greatest and most influential of his generation, and yet he was also an unabashed Legal Realist. Understanding that apparently puzzling combination of attributes is essential to understanding the real essence of American Legal Realism.

Wright’s self-description as a Legal Realist must, of course, seem strange to anyone who recalls how the Legal Realists of the 1920s greeted the newly created American Law Institute and its proposed restatements of the law. The great torts scholar and reformer Leon Green declared in 1928 that “[t]he undertaking to restate the rules and principles developed by the English and American courts finds in the field of torts a most hopeless task.”<sup>3</sup> Charles Clark, for whom Wright later clerked on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, denounced the *Restatement of the Law of Contracts* as having “the rigidity of a code . . . without the opportunity for reform and advance which a code affords.”<sup>4</sup> And no student of Legal Realism or the American Law Institute can forget Yale psychologist Edward Robinson’s impassioned denunciation in the pages of the *Yale Law Journal* in 1934:

And so the American Law Institute has thought that it can help simple-minded lawyers by giving an artificial and arbitrary picture of the principles in terms of which human disputes are supposed to be settled. . . .

. . . .

---

<sup>2</sup> CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT ET AL., *FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE* (1969–2014).

<sup>3</sup> Leon Green, *The Duty Problem in Negligence Cases*, 28 COLUM. L. REV. 1014, 1014 (1928).

<sup>4</sup> Charles E. Clark, *The Restatement of the Law of Contracts*, 42 YALE L.J. 643, 650 (1933).

[But s]uch bodies of logically consistent doctrines as those formulated by the experts of the American Law Institute are obviously not to be considered as efforts to understand the legal institution as it is. When one considers these “restatements” of the common law and how they are being formulated, one remembers how the expert theologians got together in the Council of Nicaea and decided by a vote the nature of the Trinity. There is a difference between the two occasions. The church fathers had far more power than does the Law Institute to enforce belief in their conclusion.<sup>5</sup>

Notwithstanding the vituperative rhetoric of many early Legal Realists,<sup>6</sup> it is not inexplicable why Wright, the first law professor to lead the ALI, a professed Realist and a protégé of Judge Clark, would assume its mantle.

The beginnings of an answer are to be found in one of the seminal documents of Legal Realism, Herman Oliphant’s 1927 address as President of the Association of American Law Schools, tellingly titled “A Return to *Stare Decisis*.”<sup>7</sup> The title is notable precisely because a “return” to the binding force of precedents would be a return to a regime in which the holdings of earlier courts—their articulations of doctrine—actually did bind the decisions of later courts on relevantly similar facts—which was precisely Oliphant’s aspiration. Oliphant was worried that the legal doctrines actually promulgated by courts and scholars had become too general and abstract, ignoring the particular factual contexts (or “situation-types” as Realists called them) in

---

<sup>5</sup> Edward S. Robinson, *Law—An Unscientific Science*, 44 YALE L.J. 235, 260–61 (1934).

<sup>6</sup> Not all were quite so negative; Walter Wheeler Cook, for example, welcomed “the movement inaugurated by the formation of the Institute [as] deserv[ing] the cordial support of the legal profession and of the country at large.” Walter Wheeler Cook, *The American Law Institute*, THE NEW REPUBLIC, Mar. 21, 1923, at 89.

<sup>7</sup> Herman Oliphant, *A Return to Stare Decisis*, 14 A.B.A. J. 71 (1928).

which the original disputes arose. The result was that these doctrines no longer had any value for judges in later cases, who simply “respond to the stimulus of the facts in the concrete cases before them rather than to the stimulus of over-general and outworn abstractions in [prior] opinions and treatises.”<sup>8</sup> Oliphant argued that a meaningful doctrine of *stare decisis* could be restored by making legal doctrines more fact-specific, by tailoring them to the particular factual scenarios which brought forth judicial hunches about fairness and justice. So, for example, instead of pretending that there is a single, general rule about the enforceability of contractual promises not to compete, Oliphant suggested that we attend to how the courts are really deciding cases about the validity of such promises: namely, enforcing those promises, when made by the seller of a business to the buyer; but not enforcing those promises, when made by an employee to his employer.<sup>9</sup> In the former scenario, Oliphant claimed, the courts were simply doing the economically sensible thing (no one would buy a business, after all, if the seller could simply open up shop next door and compete); while in the latter scenario, courts were taking account of the prevailing informal norms governing labor relations at the time, which disfavored such promises as unjust in light of the unequal economic position of employer and employee.

Now we can see both what the critics of the ALI were worried about, and why Wright could, like Oliphant, consider himself a thorough-going Realist. The Realist critics of the ALI feared that the Restatements would simply codify “over-general and outworn abstractions” that courts might recite but which shed no light on what they were doing. By contrast, Wright conceived of the Restatements in precisely the spirit in which Oliphant called for a return to *stare decisis*: namely, as a way of restating legal doctrines in ways that were more fact-specific, and thus more descriptive of the relevant grounds of decision. (In this regard, it is surely worth

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 75.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 159.

noting that the *Restatement (Second) of Contracts* in fact incorporates something very close to Oliphant's distinction between different kinds of promises not to compete!<sup>10</sup>)

At times, the Legal Realists got carried away with this approach. Consider Leon Green's remarkable 1931 textbook on torts,<sup>11</sup> which was organized *not* by the traditional *doctrinal* categories (for example, negligence, intentional torts, strict liability), but rather by the factual scenarios or situation-types in which harms occur: "surgical operations," "keeping of animals," "traffic and transportation," and so forth. The premise of such an approach was that there was not a law of torts *per se*, but many laws of torts specific to different situations in which injuries occur. By characterizing the rules in ways specific to these recurring factual scenarios, the rules would better capture the fact-specific intuitions about fairness and justice that actually motivated the courts. Those who took over the Green casebook later relaxed this organization in favor of more traditional doctrinal section headings,<sup>12</sup> indicating that it had probably gone too far in the direction of making governing doctrines fact-specific. So, too, the restatements have not gone to the extremes of Green's first edition of the torts casebook, but they have, in their way, maintained an allegiance to the Realist heritage exemplified by Oliphant and Wright.

To be sure, Realism has, over time, come to be associated with many other doctrines which are far-removed from Oliphant's, Green's and Wright's Realism—a Realism, it is worth emphasizing, that was the dominant strand among writers associated with that movement, from Karl Llewellyn to Underhill Moore.<sup>13</sup> Those who think of Realism as standing for what we might call the "gastrointestinal theory of judicial decision"—what the judge ate for breakfast

---

<sup>10</sup> RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONTRACTS (1981).

<sup>11</sup> LEON GREEN, *THE JUDICIAL PROCESS IN TORT CASES* (1st ed. 1931).

<sup>12</sup> "1977": LEON GREEN ET AL., *CASES ON THE LAW OF TORTS* (2nd ed. 1977).

<sup>13</sup> See Brian Leiter, *Rethinking Legal Realism: Toward A Naturalized Jurisprudence*, 76 TEX. L. REV. 267 (1997), reprinted in BRIAN LEITER, *NATURALIZING JURISPRUDENCE: ESSAYS ON AMERICAN LEGAL REALISM AND NATURALISM IN LEGAL PHILOSOPHY* 15 (2007).

explains the decision—would, indeed, find it puzzling to find a Realist taking doctrine seriously, let alone serving at the helm of the American Law Institute. But no Realist ever advocated the gastrointestinal theory, and only one, Jerome Frank, ever came close to elevating the all-too-human psychological idiosyncrasies of individual judges to the status of the pivotal factor in legal decision-making. But Frank’s view was properly rebutted by Felix Cohen’s apt observation in the *Columbia Law Review* in 1935. “Judges are human,” wrote Cohen, “but they are a peculiar breed of humans, selected to a type and held to service under a potent system of government controls. . . . A truly realistic theory of judicial decisions must conceive every decision as something more than an expression of individual personality, as . . . even more importantly . . . a product of social determinants.”<sup>14</sup>

Although most Realists rejected Jerome Frank’s extremism for reasons similar to Felix Cohen’s, they never produced a systematic theory of the “social determinants” of judicial decisions, settling instead for observations, like Max Radin’s, that “the standard transactions with their regulatory incidents are families ones to [the judge] because of his experience as a citizen and a lawyer,” where it is this background and experience that explains the predictable way in which judges respond to differing situation-types.<sup>15</sup> In recent decades, Professor Douglas Laycock has made a similar point, in his seminal, Realist-style debunking of the irreparable injury rule. The irreparable injury rule states courts will not enjoin misconduct when money damages will suffice to compensate the victim. According to Professor Laycock:

Courts do prevent harm when they can. Judicial opinions recite the rule constantly, but they do not apply it. . . .

---

<sup>14</sup> Felix S. Cohen, *Transcendental Nonsense and the Functional Approach*, 35 COLUM. L. REV. 809, 843 (1935).

<sup>15</sup> Max Radin, *The Theory of Judicial Decision: Or How Judges Think*, 11 A.B.A. J. 357, 358 (1925).



. . . . When courts reject plaintiff's choice of remedy, there is always some other reason, and that reason has nothing to do with the irreparable injury rule. . . .

. . . .

. . . . An intuitive sense of justice has led judges to produce sensible results, but there has been no similar pressure to produce sensible explanations.<sup>16</sup>

The decision-makers' "intuitive sense of justice," inspired by what Oliphant called "the stimulus of the facts in the concrete case before them" was central to the Realist's theory of how judges decide cases. As Judge Joseph Hutcheson put it in his famous 1929 article on "The Judgment Intuitive: The Function of the 'Hunch' in Judicial Decision," "the vital, motivating impulse for the decision is an intuitive sense of what is right or wrong for that cause."<sup>17</sup> Thus, Karl Llewellyn advised young lawyers in training that, while they must provide the court "a technical ladder" justifying the result, what the lawyer must really do is "on the facts . . . persuade the court your case is sound."<sup>18</sup>

One reason many scholars misunderstand the relationship between Legal Realism and doctrine has to do with the more recent reinvention of Legal Realism by the Critical Legal Studies ("CLS") writers in the 1980s, who also obscured the profound influence of Realism on American law, including through the work of the American Law Institute.<sup>19</sup> For example, the

---

<sup>16</sup> DOUGLAS LAYCOCK, *THE DEATH OF THE IRREPARABLE INJURY RULE* vii, ix (1991).

<sup>17</sup> Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., *The Judgment Intuitive: The Function of the "Hunch" in Judicial Decision*, 14 *CORN. L.Q.* 274, 285 (1929).

<sup>18</sup> KARL N. LLEWELLYN, *THE BRAMBLE BUSH* 71 (11th prtg. 2008).

<sup>19</sup> The misrepresentations of Realism more recently in Brian Tamanaha's work have not helped either. See his *BEYOND THE REALIST/FORMALIST DIVIDE: THE ROLE OF POLITICS IN JUDGING* (2009) and the documentation of the misrepresentations of both Realism, and of some of his primary sources in Brian Leiter, *Legal Realism and Legal Formalism: What is the Issue?*, 16 *LEGAL THEORY* 111 (2010). It should constitute scholarly malpractice to cite Tamanaha's careless book for any proposition other than that 19<sup>th</sup>-century jurists and scholars

CLS version of Realism made much out of an argument against the “public-private” distinction, due to the Columbia economist Robert Hale and the philosopher Morris Cohen, figures who were, in reality, on the margins of the Realist movement.<sup>20</sup> The argument runs basically as follows: since it is governmental decisions that create and structure the so-called private sphere (namely, by creating and enforcing a regime of property and contractual rights), there should be no presumption of “non-intervention” in this “private” realm (namely, the marketplace) because it is, in essence, a public creature. There is, in short, no natural baseline beyond which government cannot pass without becoming “interventionist” and non-neutral, because the baseline itself is an artifact of government regulation. Despite the blatant non-sequitur involved (it does not follow that it is normatively permissible for government to regulate the “private” sphere from the mere fact that government created the “private” sphere through establishing a structure of rights), this argument has proved very popular with legal academics beyond CLS.<sup>21</sup> But it has almost nothing to do with Legal Realism, which, at its core, was concerned with providing lawyers practical help in understanding why appellate courts actually decide as they do.

The CLS writers also proffered a more radical and implausible claim about the indeterminacy of legal reasoning than any put forward by the Legal Realists. Realists like Llewellyn had argued that the “law” was indeterminate largely by appealing to familiar methods of legal and judicial reasoning, and showing how these methods often conflicted, leading, e.g., to

---

recognized that common-law judges make law (i.e., they were not all Natural Lawyers) and that judging was not a mechanical process (“Vulgar Formalism”). But neither of the preceding claims were at issue in the Realist dispute with formalism, and Tamanaha wrongly assimilates Realism to the CLS view that judging is political.

<sup>20</sup> It bears noting that Robert Hale was not a lawyer, but an economist, who had relatively little involvement with the major Realists. And Cohen was, in fact, generally a critic of Realism. Nonetheless, this flawed argument became central to the CLS version of Legal Realism.

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Cass R. Sunstein, *Lochner’s Legacy*, 87 COLUM. L. REV. 873, 917–19 (1987); J.M. Balkin, *Some Realism About Pluralism: Legal Realist Approaches to the First Amendment*, 1990 DUKE L.J. 375 (1990).

a “strict” and a “loose” interpretation of a precedent, or to opposed ways of reading the same statutory provision.<sup>22</sup> CLS writers, by contrast, took a rather different, and more theoretically ambitious tact. They located the source of “indeterminacy” in law in one of two sources: either in general features of language itself (drawing here—not always accurately—on the semantic skepticism associated with Wittgenstein and Derrida<sup>23</sup>); or in the existence of “contradictory” moral and political principles that they claim underlie the substantive law, understood at a suitable level of abstraction.<sup>24</sup> This foray into theoretically ambitious, but often philosophically unsound, critiques of legal reasoning explains why, as Professor Rock observes in his contribution, “CLS has not . . . had anywhere near the impact on the culture of legal education or legal thinking that” Realism has.<sup>25</sup>

Professor Rock’s essay also calls attention to one of the most puzzling aspects of Legal Realism for an American common lawyer, namely, the failure of Realism to get any traction in the most important commonwealth jurisdiction, England. Professor Rock, with his illuminating examples from corporate or “company” law, rightly characterizes this difference as more stylistic than substantive, since “in a field such as corporate law . . . market and institutional pressures demand practical solution to practical problems” that turn out to be similar despite “different implicit jurisprudence in the two systems.”<sup>26</sup> But why did the Legal Realism which seems so obvious and sensible to leading American lawyers, from Edward Levi<sup>27</sup> to Edward Rock, gain so little traction in England?

---

<sup>22</sup> For citations and discussion, see Leiter, *supra* note 13.

<sup>23</sup> For a critical discussion of this aspect of CLS, see Jules L. Coleman & Brian Leiter, *Determinacy, Objectivity, and Authority*, 142 U. PA. L. REV. 549, 568–72 (1993).

<sup>24</sup> The most famous example of this strategy of CLS argument is Duncan Kennedy, *Form and Substance in Private Law Adjudication*, 89 HARV. L. REV. 1685 (1976).

<sup>25</sup> Edward B. Rock, *Corporate Law Doctrine and the Legacy of American Legal Realism*, 163 U. PA. L. REV. [STARTING PAGE NUMBER], [QUOTE PAGE NUMBER] (2015).

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at [QUOTE PAGE NUMBER].

<sup>27</sup> EDWARD LEVI, AN INTRODUCTION TO LEGAL REASONING (1949).

I begin with an anecdote. Peter Birks, late Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford and a leading scholar of the law of restitution, was a visiting professor at the University of Texas when I taught there. Once, in the faculty lounge, while we were chatting about Legal Realism, he said to me that the central problem with Realism was that it was “immoral”—not false, but immoral! Of course, Birks thought it false too, but by deeming it “immoral” he meant it encouraged the pernicious idea that legal doctrines do not significantly constrain the decisions, at least of the appellate courts. And I take it he worried that by suggesting as much, it might lead judges to make decisions based on “policy” rather than on law. But as Professor Rock’s discussion of the substantive convergence of American and English “corporate” law shows, the policy considerations that are explicit on the American side are also at work, albeit implicitly, on the English side. So why the hostility to this Realist insight?

I venture three hypotheses as to why the other great common law legal system should be so “skeptical” about Realist skepticism about the traditional role of doctrine. First, the English system of higher education requires the young person to commit to a course of study at a very early age (late teens), while all American students take law as a post-graduate degree *after* completing a different course of study, which might be economics or history or psychology. One perhaps predictable result is that the English youngster who has given over so much of his life to the study of legal doctrine is more inclined to take it seriously, at “face value,” than the person who has had some exposure to historical, economic, and psychological perspectives on human institutions.

Second, the English judiciary is still largely a civil service system, with advancement predicated on professional competence as assessed by peers. That obviously has an important disciplining effect on the judiciary, restricting, one imagines, the freedom in argument and

interpretation so characteristic of American judges, who are either elected or appointed for politically partisan reasons. So perhaps English judges *really are* more committed to doctrine than their American counterparts? Third, as Grant Gilmore argued long ago,<sup>28</sup> the existence of a federal system in America means that there are 51 jurisdictions in one country—the federal legal system and that of the fifty states—with the result that almost any legal argument can claim a pedigree in some court’s decision. That too might make the Realist diagnosis of the indeterminacy of legal doctrine and reasoning more apt in the American than the English context.

And, yet, as Professor Rock’s examples show, the Americans and the English end up in roughly similar places when it comes to the corporate law issues he considers. That fact strongly suggests that English indignation at Realism is misplaced. It may be that arbiters of disputes, whether American or English, share enough common normative intuitions that they reach similar outcomes—that might be explained by the demands of capitalism in the modern era, or the socialization of the decision-makers, or both. The crucial fact, though, is that judges resolve disputes, and they do so by reference to normative standards that enjoy sufficient resonance in the communities in which they are binding that whether those normative standards are official “legal doctrine” or only educated “situation-sense” does not matter: the legitimacy and viability of legal orders depends on quite a bit more than whether or not its outcomes are licensed by doctrine. It was the ambition of American Legal Realism, to be sure, to bring existing doctrine “down to earth,” meaning down to the level of the normative expectations of those whose disputes came before the courts. One reason American legal education has veered so heavily away from “merely” doctrinal education to interdisciplinary education is precisely because the

---

<sup>28</sup> Grant Gilmore, *Legal Realism: Its Cause and Cure*, 70 Yale L.J. 1037, 1039–40, 1042, 1046 (1961).

normative expectations for behavior to which courts are quite plainly sensitive are not those captured by the doctrinal categories of yesteryear. Economic efficiency norms are, unsurprisingly in capitalist democracies, the most important, but sensitivity to political and social norms has clearly played a crucial role in adjudication in other domains.<sup>29</sup> There may come a day in which Legal Realism is banal, and that is what the Realists would have expected: for we could get to a point where our legal doctrine tracks judicial intuitions about what is normatively important on the facts of the case, and at that point, we will have no need for Realist skepticism about existing doctrinal categories. In the United States, we may not yet be there, but we are getting close.

---

<sup>29</sup> *See, e.g.*, LUCAS A. POWE, JR., *THE WARREN COURT AND AMERICAN POLITICS* (2000).

Readers with comments may address them to:

Professor Brian Leiter  
University of Chicago Law School  
1111 East 60th Street  
Chicago, IL 60637  
[bleiter@uchicago.edu](mailto:bleiter@uchicago.edu)

**The University of Chicago Law School**  
**Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper Series**

For a listing of papers 1–400 please go to <http://www.law.uchicago.edu/publications/papers/publiclaw>.

401. Gary Becker, François Ewald, and Bernard Harcourt, “Becker on Ewald on Foucault on Becker” American Neoliberalism and Michel Foucault’s 1979 *Birth of Biopolitics* Lectures, September 2012
402. M. Todd Henderson, Voice versus Exit in Health Care Policy, October 2012
403. Aziz Z. Huq, Enforcing (but Not Defending) “Unconstitutional” Laws, October 2012
404. Lee Anne Fennell, Resource Access Costs, October 2012
405. Brian Leiter, Legal Realisms, Old and New, October 2012
406. Tom Ginsburg, Daniel Lnasberg-Rodriguez, and Mila Versteeg, When to Overthrow Your Government: The Right to Resist in the World’s Constitutions, November 2012
407. Brian Leiter and Alex Langlinais, The Methodology of Legal Philosophy, November 2012
408. Alison L. LaCroix, The Lawyer’s Library in the Early American Republic, November 2012
409. Alison L. LaCroix, Eavesdropping on the Vox Populi, November 2012
410. Alison L. LaCroix, On Being “Bound Thereby,” November 2012
411. Alison L. LaCroix, What If Madison had Won? Imagining a Constitution World of Legislative Supremacy, November 2012
412. Jonathan S. Masur and Eric A. Posner, Unemployment and Regulatory Policy, December 2012
413. Alison LaCroix, Historical Gloss: A Primer, January 2013
414. Jennifer Nou, Agency Self-Insulation under Presidential Review, January 2013
415. Aziz Z. Huq, Removal as a Political Question, February 2013
416. Adam B. Cox and Thomas J. Miles, Policing Immigration, February 2013
417. Anup Malani and Jonathan S. Masur, Raising the Stakes in Patent Cases, February 2013
418. Ariel Porat and Lior Strahilevits, Personalizing Default Rules and Disclosure with Big Data, February 2013
419. Douglas G. Baird and Anthony J. Casey, Bankruptcy Step Zero, February 2013
420. Alison L. LaCroix, The Interbellum Constitution and the Spending Power, March 2013
421. Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, Toward a Positive Theory of Privacy Law, March 2013
422. Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, Inside or Outside the System? March 2013
423. Nicholas G. Stephanopoulos, The Consequences of Consequentialist Criteria, March 2013
424. Aziz Z. Huq, The Social Production of National Security, March 2013
425. Aziz Z. Huq, Federalism, Liberty, and Risk in *NIFB v. Sebelius*, April 2013
426. Lee Anne Fennell, Property in Housing, April 2013
427. Lee Anne Fennell, Crowdsourcing Land Use, April 2013
428. William H. J. Hubbard, An Empirical Study of the Effect of *Shady Grove v. Allstate* on Forum Shopping in the New York Courts, May 2013
429. Daniel Abebe and Aziz Z. Huq, Foreign Affairs Federalism: A Revisionist Approach, May 2013
430. Albert W. Alschuler, *Lafler* and *Frye*: Two Small Band-Aids for a Festering Wound, June 2013
431. Tom Ginsburg, Jonathan S. Masur, and Richard H. McAdams, Libertarian Paternalism, Path Dependence, and Temporary Law, June 2013
432. Aziz Z. Huq, Tiers of Scrutiny in Enumerated Powers Jurisprudence, June 2013



433. Bernard Harcourt, Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments*: A Mirror of the History of the Foundations of Modern Criminal Law, July 2013
434. Zachary Elkins, Tom Ginsburg, and Beth Simmons, Getting to Rights: Treaty Ratification, Constitutional Convergence, and Human Rights Practice, July 2013
435. Christopher Buccafusco and Jonathan S. Masur, Innovation and Incarceration: An Economic Analysis of Criminal Intellectual Property Law, July 2013
436. Rosalind Dixon and Tom Ginsburg, The South African Constitutional Court and Socio-Economic Rights as 'Insurance Swaps', August 2013
437. Bernard E. Harcourt, The Collapse of the Harm Principle Redux: On Same-Sex Marriage, the Supreme Court's Opinion in *United States v. Windsor*, John Stuart Mill's essay *On Liberty* (1859), and H.L.A. Hart's Modern Harm Principle, August 2013
438. Brian Leiter, Nietzsche against the Philosophical Canon, April 2013
439. Sital Kalantry, Women in Prison in Argentina: Causes, Conditions, and Consequences, May 2013
440. Becker and Foucault on Crime and Punishment, A Conversation with Gary Becker, François Ewald, and Bernard Harcourt: The Second Session, September 2013
441. Daniel Abebe, One Voice or Many? The Political Question Doctrine and Acoustic Dissonance in Foreign Affairs, September 2013
442. Brian Leiter, Why Legal Positivism (Again)? September 2013
443. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, Elections and Alignment, September 2013
444. Elizabeth Chorvat, Taxation and Liquidity: Evidence from Retirement Savings, September 2013
445. Elizabeth Chorvat, Looking Through' Corporate Expatriations for Buried Intangibles, September 2013
446. William H. J. Hubbard, A Fresh Look at Plausibility Pleading, March 2015
447. Tom Ginsburg, Nick Foti, and Daniel Rockmore, "We the Peoples": The Global Origins of Constitutional Preambles, March 2014
448. Lee Anne Fennell and Eduardo M. Peñalver, Exactions Creep, December 2013
449. Lee Anne Fennell, Forcings, December 2013
450. Jose Antonio Cheibub, Zachary Elkins, and Tom Ginsburg, Beyond Presidentialism and Parliamentarism, December 2013
451. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, The South after Shelby County, October 2013
452. Lisa Bernstein, Trade Usage in the Courts: The Flawed Conceptual and Evidentiary Basis of Article 2's Incorporation Strategy, November 2013
453. Tom Ginsburg, Political Constraints on International Courts, December 2013
454. Roger Allan Ford, Patent Invalidity versus Noninfringement, December 2013
455. M. Todd Henderson and William H.J. Hubbard, Do Judges Follow the Law? An Empirical Test of Congressional Control over Judicial Behavior, January 2014
456. Aziz Z. Huq, Does the Logic of Collective Action Explain Federalism Doctrine? January 2014
457. Alison L. LaCroix, The Shadow Powers of Article I, January 2014
458. Eric A. Posner and Alan O. Sykes, Voting Rules in International Organizations, January 2014
459. John Rappaport, Second-Order Regulation of Law Enforcement, April 2014
460. Nuno Garoupa and Tom Ginsburg, Judicial Roles in Nonjudicial Functions, February 2014
461. Aziz Huq, Standing for the Structural Constitution, February 2014
462. Jennifer Nou, Sub-regulating Elections, February 2014
463. Albert W. Alschuler, Terrible Tools for Prosecutors: Notes on Senator Leahy's Proposal to "Fix" *Skilling v. United States*, February 2014
464. Aziz Z. Huq, Libertarian Separation of Powers, February 2014

465. Brian Leiter, Preface to the Paperback Edition of *Why Tolerate Religion?* February 2014
466. Jonathan S. Masur and Lisa Larrimore Ouellette, *Deference Mistakes*, March 2014
467. Eric A. Posner, *Martii Koskeniemi on Human Rights: An Empirical Perspective*, March 2014
468. Tom Ginsburg and Alberto Simpser, Introduction, chapter 1 of *Constitutions in Authoritarian Regimes*, April 2014
469. Aziz Z. Huq, *Habeas and the Roberts Court*, April 2014
470. Aziz Z. Huq, *The Function of Article V*, April 2014
471. Aziz Z. Huq, *Coasean Bargaining over the Structural Constitution*, April 2014
472. Tom Ginsburg and James Melton, *Does the Constitutional Amendment Rule Matter at All? Amendment Cultures and the Challenges of Measuring Amendment Difficulty*, May 2014
473. Eric A. Posner and E. Glen Weyl, *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Financial Regulations: A Response to Criticisms*, May 2014
474. Paige A. Epstein, *Addressing Minority Vote Dilution Through State Voting Rights Acts*, February 2014
475. William Baude, *Zombie Federalism*, April 2014
476. Albert W. Alschuler, *Regarding Re's Revisionism: Notes on "The Due Process Exclusionary Rule"*, May 2014
477. Dawood I. Ahmed and Tom Ginsburg, *Constitutional Islamization and Human Rights: The Surprising Origin and Spread of Islamic Supremacy in Constitutions*, May 2014
478. David Weisbach, *Distributionally-Weighted Cost Benefit Analysis: Welfare Economics Meets Organizational Design*, June 2014
479. William H. J. Hubbard, *Nuisance Suits*, June 2014
480. Saul Levmore and Ariel Porat, *Credible Threats*, July 2014
481. Brian Leiter, *The Case Against Free Speech*, June 2014
482. Brian Leiter, *Marx, Law, Ideology, Legal Positivism*, July 2014
483. John Rappaport, *Unbundling Criminal Trial Rights*, August 2014
484. Daniel Abebe, *Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Nile: The Economics of International Water Law*, August 2014
485. Albert W. Alschuler, *Limiting Political Contributions after *Mccutcheon*, *Citizens United*, and *SpeechNow**, August 2014
486. Zachary Elkins, Tom Ginsburg, and James Melton, *Comments on Law and Versteeg's "The Declining Influence of the United States Constitution,"* August 2014
487. William H. J. Hubbard, *The Discovery Sombrero, and Other Metaphors for Litigation*, September 2014
488. Genevieve Lakier, *The Invention of Low-Value Speech*, September 2014
489. Lee Anne Fennell and Richard H. McAdams, *Fairness in Law and Economics: Introduction*, October 2014
490. Thomas J. Miles and Adam B. Cox, *Does Immigration Enforcement Reduce Crime? Evidence from 'Secure Communities'*, October 2014
491. Ariel Porat and Omri Yadlin, *Valuable Lies*, October 2014
492. Laura M. Weinrib, *Civil Liberties outside the Courts*, October 2014
493. Nicholas Stephanopoulos and Eric McGhee, *Partisan Gerrymandering and the Efficiency Gap*, October 2014
494. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, *Aligning Campaign Finance Law*, October 2014
495. John Bronsteen, Christopher Buccafusco and Jonathan S. Masur, *Well-Being and Public Policy*, November 2014
496. Lee Anne Fennell, *Agglomerama*, December 2014

497. Avital Mentovich, Aziz Z. Huq, and Moran Cerf, *The Psychology of Corporate Rights*, December 2014
498. Lee Anne Fennell and Richard H. McAdams, *The Distributive Deficit in Law and Economics*, January 2015
499. Omri Ben-Shahar and Kyle D. Logue, *Under the Weather: Government Insurance and the Regulation of Climate Risks*, January 2015
500. Adam M. Samaha and Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, *Don't Ask, Must Tell—and Other Combinations*, January 2015
501. Eric A. Posner and Cass R. Sunstein, *Institutional Flip-Flops*, January 2015
502. Albert W. ALSchuler, *Criminal Corruption: Why Broad Definitions of Bribery Make Things Worse*, January 2015
503. Jonathan S. Masur and Eric A. Posner, *Toward a Pigovian State*, February 2015
504. Richard H. McAdams, *Vengeance, Complicity and Criminal Law in Othello*, February 2015
505. Richard H. McAdams, Dhammika Dharmapala, and Nuno Garoupa, *The Law of Police*, February 2015
506. William Baude, *Sharing the Necessary and Proper Clause*, November 2014
507. William Baude, *State Regulation and the Necessary and Proper Clause*, December 2014
508. William Baude, *Foreword: The Supreme Court's Shadow Docket*, January 2015
509. Lee Fennell, *Slicing Spontaneity*, February 2015
510. Steven Douglas Smith, Michael B. Rappaport, William Baude, and Stephen E. Sachs, *The New and Old Originalism: A Discussion*, February 2015
511. Alison L. LaCroix, *A Man For All Treasons: Crimes By and Against the Tudor State in the Novels of Hilary Mantel*, February 2015
512. Alison L. LaCroix, *Continuity in Secession: The Case of the Confederate Constitution*, February 2015
513. Adam S. Chilton and Eric A. Posner, *The Influence of History on States' Compliance with Human Rights Obligations*, March 2015
514. Brian Leiter, *Reply to Five Critics of Why Tolerate Religion?* August 2014
515. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, *Teaching Election Law*, September 2014
516. Susan Nevelow Mart and Tom Ginsburg, *[Dis-]Informing the People's Discretion: Judicial Deference Under the National Security Exemption of the Freedom of Information Act*, November 2014
517. Brian Leiter, *The Paradoxes of Public Philosophy*, November 2014
518. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, Eric McGhee, and Steven Rogers, *The Realities of Electoral Reform*, January 2015
519. Brian Leiter, *Constitutional Law, Moral Judgment, and the Supreme Court as Super-Legislature*, January 2015
520. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, *Arizona and Anti-Reform*, January 2015
521. Lee Anne Fennell, *Do Not Cite or Circulate*, February 2015
522. Aziz Z. Huq, *The Difficulties of Democratic Mercy*, March 2015
523. Aziz Z. Huq, *Agency Slack and the Design of Criminal Justice Institutions*, March 2015
524. Aziz Z. Huq, *Judicial Independence and the Rationing of Constitutional Remedies*, March 2015
525. Zachary Clopton, *Redundant Public-Private Enforcement*, March 2015
526. Nicholas Stephanopoulos, *Political Powerlessness*, March 2015
527. Brian Leiter, *Normativity for Naturalists*, March 2015
528. Brian Leiter, *Legal Realism and Legal Doctrine*, April 2015