

2007

On Learning from Others

Cass R. Sunstein

Eric A. Posner

Follow this and additional works at: [https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/
public_law_and_legal_theory](https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/public_law_and_legal_theory)

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Chicago Unbound includes both works in progress and final versions of articles. Please be aware that a more recent version of this article may be available on Chicago Unbound, SSRN or elsewhere.

Recommended Citation

Cass R. Sunstein & Eric Posner, "On Learning from Others" (University of Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Working Paper No. 162, 2007).

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.



ON LEARNING FROM OTHERS

Eric A. Posner
Cass R. Sunstein

RESPONSE

ON LEARNING FROM OTHERS

Eric A. Posner* and Cass R. Sunstein**

Some people think that the practices of many courts in many countries, or in many relevant countries, offer helpful guidance to courts in other countries, when those courts are approaching hard or novel questions.¹ In their view, the practices of many courts create a body of law in which other courts should be highly interested. The obvious question is: Why?

In *The Law of Other States*,² we attempt to make progress on this question. Our focus was not principally on the use of foreign precedents in the constitutional rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court. We meant to take that controversial and specialized problem as part of a much more general one, which involves courts in one jurisdiction using the decisions of courts in other jurisdictions. Within the United States, state courts frequently refer to the decisions of other state courts, even when construing state constitutions.³ The high courts of many nations refer to the decisions of high courts of other nations.⁴ The problem is that it is not self-evident that the practices of courts A-Y should be taken as valuable or informative for court Z. Exploration of that problem might also illuminate the question of whether and when a legislator or administrator in one state should attend to the decisions of legislators or administrators in other states.

Our principal submission was that the problem is helpfully approached through the lens of the Condorcet Jury Theorem (CJT). If many people have (independently) decided that X is true, or that Y is good, the CJT gives us reason, under identifiable conditions, to believe that X is true and that Y is

* Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law, University of Chicago.

** Karl N. Llewellyn Distinguished Service Professor, Law School and Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

1. See, e.g., Jeremy Waldron, *The Supreme Court, 2004 Term—Comment: Foreign Law and the Modern Ius Gentium*, 119 HARV. L. REV. 129 (2005).

2. See Eric A. Posner & Cass R. Sunstein, *The Law of Other States*, 59 STAN. L. REV. 131 (2006).

3. See *id.* at 133-35.

4. See *id.* at 135.

good. In our view, the CJT helps to formalize the intuition that if most courts have decided in favor of a certain result, other courts (and perhaps legislators and executive officials as well) should pay attention to their decisions. But if the CJT provides the strongest reason for the practice of consulting the law of other states, it also offers a series of important cautionary notes. If the courts of other states are systematically biased, or if most such courts are in a cascade, or if their judgments do not bear on any relevant proposition, then their conclusions do not deserve much attention. We hope that these points have general implications for the question of whether an institution, either public or private, might pay respectful attention to the decisions of many other institutions on the same topic.

In his generous and illuminating reply, Nicholas Rosenkranz understands us to have defended the U.S. Supreme Court's occasional practice of consulting the decisions of other high courts.⁵ But that was not our goal. Using the CJT, we meant to understand not only why a court might be interested in the decisions of other courts, but also on what assumptions that interest might be unjustified. We noted, for example, that originalists might not be especially concerned about the practices of other courts in other nations, because those practices would not bear on the Constitution's original meaning.⁶ It would certainly be possible to read our analysis to explain (a) why state courts should pay attention to the decisions of other state courts, (b) why high courts in India and South Africa should pay attention to the decisions of high courts in other nations, and (c) why the U.S. Supreme Court, on certain assumptions about constitutional method, does best to ignore the decisions of high courts in other nations.⁷ Rosenkranz's principal argument seems to be that originalists are not likely to be impressed with the CJT approach. We are tempted merely to applaud. But here as elsewhere, things are not quite so simple.

Suppose that the original understanding of the Constitution requires courts to answer some question of fact. Perhaps a restriction of "the freedom of speech" is permissible, on the original understanding, if the government has a very strong reason for imposing the restriction; perhaps the original understanding requires an assessment of the strength of the government's reason. If so, the CJT approach may be compatible with originalism.⁸ Imagine that all (relevant) courts, in other nations, believe that restrictions on false commercial advertising are acceptable. That unanimous view may well provide useful information on a pertinent question of fact—whether, for example, restrictions on false commercial advertising are likely to interfere with legitimate political debate or might end up limiting market competition by

5. See Nicholas Quinn Rosenkranz, *Condorcet and the Constitution: A Response to The Law of Other States*, 59 STAN. L. REV 1281 (2007).

6. See Posner & Sunstein, *supra* note 2, at 137-38, 150, 172.

7. Because we did not attempt to identify the proper constitutional method, we did not come to a final conclusion on this question.

8. See Posner & Sunstein, *supra* note 2, at 137-38.

reducing the ability of new entrants to bring their products to the attention of the public. One might reasonably think that if other democratic states can tolerate such restrictions, or if other market economies can flourish despite such restrictions, then restricting commercial advertising provides significant benefits and imposes few costs.

Or suppose that the word “unreasonable” in the Fourth Amendment requires courts to make judgments of both fact and value in order to decide whether a certain search is reasonable. If all other (relevant) courts believe that it is “reasonable” to undertake administrative searches under provisions that require an assessment of the reasonableness of searches and seizures, the CJT approach deserves attention. The experiences of other states may provide courts with information about whether such searches are likely to be intrusive or not, whether less restrictive substitutes are available, and whether the searches provide valuable information. Whether originalism is compatible with the CJT approach depends on the nature of the original understanding, and we cannot know that without investigating that understanding.

Rosenkranz is right, however, to emphasize that in many domains, the original understanding will require courts to pay no attention to the law of other states. But he also offers a more provocative argument, to the effect that an approach based on the CJT would compromise democratic values, in a way that should trouble nonoriginalists no less than originalists:

The notion of unelected judges updating the Constitution to reflect their own evolving view of good government is troubling to some, in itself. But the notion that this evolution may be brought about by changes in foreign law raises even deeper issues of democratic self-governance. Again, to put the point most sharply, when the Supreme Court declares that the Constitution evolves, and declares further that foreign law effects its evolution, it is declaring nothing less than *the power of foreign governments to change the meaning of the U.S. Constitution.*⁹

We confess that we are not sure what Rosenkranz means to say here. Do judges who depart from the original understanding engage in the project of “updating” it? The answer would be clear only if departures from the original understanding count as “updating,” which nonoriginalists deny; the word “updating” begs the question on originalism’s behalf. Nonoriginalists believe that the Constitution is binding and should not be “updated”; they reject the view that the original understanding is part of the Constitution.¹⁰ Nor is it clear what “a devotee of democracy” should fear most. Suppose that judges invoked the original understanding to strike down a great deal of democratically enacted

9. Rosenkranz, *supra* note 5, at 1304 (footnote omitted).

10. Note also that many originalists accept stare decisis and are therefore willing to adhere to decisions that depart from the original understanding. *See, e.g.*, Antonin Scalia, *Originalism: The Lesser Evil*, 57 U. CIN. L. REV. 849, 861-64 (1989) (referring to stare decisis and “faint-hearted” originalism). The idea of stare decisis is not itself in the Constitution, and originalists have not generally contended that its use is compelled by the original understanding.

legislation. Should devotees of democracy be delighted? Or suppose that whatever the original understanding, judges interpreted the founding document with a presumption of constitutionality, so as to ensure the validation of almost all democratically enacted decisions of Congress and state legislatures.¹¹ Suppose that judges did so with explicit reference to the CJT itself, on the theory that democratically enacted decisions are highly likely to reflect the views of many people.¹² Should a devotee of democracy be troubled?¹³ The relationship between originalism and democracy is uneasy at best.

Let us put these questions to one side. Rosenkranz thinks that it is bad enough for unelected judges to update the Constitution on the basis of their policy preferences; it is worse (apparently) for unelected judges to update the Constitution by relying on the law of other states. But the whole point of relying on the law of other states is to constrain judicial policy preferences. When a state court in Arizona relies on the practices of the other forty-nine states, it is not giving its own policy preferences free reign. It is engaged in a form of self-discipline.¹⁴ Our own interest in the CJT stems from the thought that judges (or legislators or administrators) might consult the practices of others to limit their own judgments by obtaining relevant information. Those who follow the general practice of many others do so to constrain their discretion, not to increase it.

Rosenkranz's most fundamental concern appears to be that under the CJT approach, foreign governments will have the power to change the meaning of the U.S. Constitution. We happily agree that it would be most unfortunate if the CJT approach gave the French Parliament the power to declare that the U.S. Constitution prohibits the death penalty. But we are not terribly worried. In fact the CJT approach would likely forbid the result that Rosenkranz fears. France has just one "vote," and the vote must be sincere. At most, France's law would do no more than express the view of one of 193 or so nations. The view is information only; it is not a political act, and it lacks authority. To the extent that France has acted sincerely, it does have the ability to inform the United

11. See ADRIAN VERMEULE, *JUDGING UNDER UNCERTAINTY: AN INSTITUTIONAL THEORY OF LEGAL INTERPRETATION* (2006).

12. See Adrian Vermeule, *Common-Law Constitutionalism and the Limits of Reason* 4-28 (Harvard Pub. Law Working Paper No. 07-02), available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=969527>.

13. A democrat might of course seek to invalidate legislation that is not produced in a genuinely democratic way. See JOHN HART ELY, *DEMOCRACY AND DISTRUST: A THEORY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW* (1980).

14. Perhaps Rosenkranz implicitly embraces the "fig leaf" theory that has been advanced by others. See, e.g., Richard A. Posner, *The Supreme Court 2004 Term—Foreword: A Political Court*, 119 HARV. L. REV. 32, 88-89 (2005) (arguing that judges incorporate their own policy preferences under the guise of applying foreign law). But if that is what is going on, there is no realistic fear that foreign states can influence American law (or, at least, their power to do so is hampered by their ability only to be a fig leaf for the policy preferences of current judges).

States, but that ability is analogous to what happens when France increases the red wine consumption of American citizens as a result of a study showing that French people who consume red wine have longer lives. Information and power are different phenomena. If the German legislature takes account of the practices of legislatures in the United States, France, Italy, and Spain, we should not fear that the latter nations have usurped the lawmaking function of the German legislature.

As an analogy, consider the development of the common law. It is possible that a British court's decision about the availability of specific performance for breach of contract could influence an Illinois common law court. (Stranger things have happened.) It would seem odd to say that, by virtue of this influence, Britain has exercised the power to change the meaning of Illinois law. The Illinois court attends to the British court not because it has special authority but because its decision is a useful source of information. To give a more pedestrian example, imagine that the Supreme Court of Arizona is interested in the law of other states. Should we be very troubled that by demonstrating that interest, the court has allowed New York and Tennessee to decide on the meaning of Arizona law?

There is a confusion, here and elsewhere, between learning and obeying—or, correlatively, informing and ordering. The United Kingdom can inform the United States of physical and (assuming they exist) moral facts—more precisely, the United Kingdom can provide to the United States information about those physical and moral facts. If the CJT were explicitly rather than intuitively incorporated into doctrine, then American courts would be constrained to take this information about facts into account. But American courts are already required to make their decisions on the basis of the facts; instructing them to take these “foreign” facts into account no more reduces their authority than instructing them to take account of valid scientific studies, perhaps from the United Kingdom, that they would otherwise be inclined to ignore. Requiring courts to follow scientific studies rather than relying on anecdotes or local knowledge reduces their discretion in the unimportant sense that it reduces their discretion to make errors. It improves their decisions. Requiring courts to use information derived from foreign sources, where and if appropriate under the governing interpretive method, should have the same effect.

Rosenkranz objects that we do not need to have unelected judges update the Constitution because Article V already provides that function. In making this argument, he shifts the debate from one about the CJT to one about originalism. Originalists believe that in defiance of Article V, nonoriginalists change the Constitution by departing from the original understanding. But the Article V argument gives originalists no help at all; the question is whether departing from the original understanding updates or changes the Constitution. Unless the key questions are begged, the CJT approach cannot be ruled off-limits by reference to Article V. State constitutions contain provisions for

amendments, and those provisions do not make it illegitimate for Arizona courts to consult the practices of other states to decide on the meaning of the Arizona Constitution.

But our principal message lies elsewhere. The question whether one state should consult the law of other states is large and interesting—much larger and more interesting than the question whether the U.S. Supreme Court, or its two originalist members, should construe the U.S. Constitution with reference to the constitutional rulings of other high courts. If the law of other states is relevant—for the Supreme Court of Arizona or the Constitutional Court of Germany or for legislators and administrators in India and Brazil—the CJT provides a useful place to start.

Readers with comments may address them to:

Professor Eric A. Posner
University of Chicago Law School
1111 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
eric_posner@law.uchicago.edu

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

1. Cass R. Sunstein and Edna Ullmann-Margalit, Second-Order Decisions (November 1999; *Ethics*, v.110, no. 1)
2. Joseph Isenbergh, Impeachment and Presidential Immunity from Judicial Process (November 1999; forthcoming *Yale Law and Policy Review* v.18 #1).
3. Cass R. Sunstein, Is the Clean Air Act Unconstitutional? (August 1999; *Michigan Law Review* #3).
4. Elizabeth Garrett, The Law and Economics of “Informed Voter” Ballot Notations (November 1999, *University of Virginia Law Review*, v. 85).
5. David A. Strauss, Do Constitutional Amendments Matter? (November 1999)
6. Cass R. Sunstein, Standing for Animals (November 1999)
7. Cass R. Sunstein, Culture and Government Money: A Guide for the Perplexed (April 2000).
8. Emily Buss, Without Peers? The Blind Spot in the Debate over How to Allocate Educational Control between Parent and State (April 2000).
9. David A. Strauss, Common Law, Common Ground, and Jefferson’s Principle (June 2000).
10. Curtis A. Bradley and Jack L. Goldsmith, Treaties, Human Rights, and Conditional Consent (May 2000; *Pennsylvania Law Review* v. 149).
11. Mary Ann Case, Lessons for the Future of Affirmative Action from the Past of the Religion Clauses? (May 2001, *Supreme Court Review*, 2000)
12. Cass R. Sunstein, Social and Economic Rights? Lessons from South Africa (May, 2000).
13. Jill Elaine Hasday, Parenthood Divided: A Legal History of the Bifurcated Law of Parental Relations (June 2001)
14. Elizabeth Garrett, Institutional Lessons from the 2000 Presidential Election (May 2001).
15. Richard A. Epstein, The Allocation of the Commons: Parking and Stopping on the Commons (August 2001).
16. Jack Goldsmith, The Internet and the Legitimacy of Remote Cross-Border Searches (October 2001).
17. Adrian Vermeule, Does Commerce Clause Review Have Perverse Effects? (October 2001).
18. Cass R. Sunstein, Of Artificial Intelligence and Legal Reasoning (November 2001).
19. Elizabeth Garrett, The Future of Campaign Finance Reform Laws in the Courts and in Congress, The William J. Brennan Lecture in Constitutional Law (December 2001).
20. Julie Roin, Taxation without Coordination (March 2002).
21. Geoffrey R. Stone, Above the Law: Research Methods, Ethics, and the Law of Privilege (March 2002; forthcoming *J. Sociological Methodology* 2002).
22. Cass R. Sunstein, Is There a Constitutional Right to Clone? (March 2002).
23. Emily Buss, Parental Rights (May 2002, forthcoming *Virginia Law Review*).
24. David A. Strauss, Must Like Cases Be Treated Alike? (May 2002).
25. David A. Strauss, The Common Law Genius of the Warren Court (May 2002).
26. Jack Goldsmith and Ryan Goodman, U.S. Civil Litigation and International Terrorism (June 2002).
27. Jack Goldsmith and Cass R. Sunstein, Military Tribunals and Legal Culture: What a Difference Sixty Years Makes (June 2002).
28. Cass R. Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule, Interpretation and Institutions (July 2002).
29. Elizabeth Garrett, Is the Party Over? The Court and the Political Process (August 2002).
30. Cass R. Sunstein, The Rights of Animals: A Very Short Primer (August 2002).
31. Joseph Isenbergh, Activists Vote Twice (November 2002).
32. Julie Roin, Truth in Government: Beyond the Tax Expenditure Budget (November 2002).
33. Cass R. Sunstein, Hazardous Heuristics (November 2002).

34. Cass R. Sunstein, Conformity and Dissent (November 2002).
35. Jill Elaine Hasday, The Principle and Practice of Women's "Full Citizenship": A Case Study of Sex-Segregated Public Education (December 2002).
36. Cass R. Sunstein, Why Does the American Constitution Lack Social and Economic Guarantees? (January 2003).
37. Adrian Vermeule, *Mead in the Trenches* (January 2003).
38. Cass R. Sunstein, Beyond the Precautionary Principle (January 2003).
39. Adrian Vermeule, The Constitutional Law of Congressional Procedure (February 2003).
40. Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, Transitional Justice as Ordinary Justice (March 2003).
41. Emily Buss, Children's Associational Rights? Why Less Is More (March 2003)
42. Emily Buss, The Speech Enhancing Effect of Internet Regulation (March 2003)
43. Cass R. Sunstein and Richard H. Thaler, Libertarian Paternalism Is Not an Oxymoron (May 2003)
44. Elizabeth Garrett, Legislating *Chevron* (April 2003)
45. Eric A. Posner, Transfer Regulations and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (April 2003)
46. Mary Ann Case, Developing a Taste for Not Being Discriminated Against (May 2003)
47. Saul Levmore and Kyle Logue, Insuring against Terrorism—and Crime (June 2003)
48. Eric Posner and Adrian Vermeule, Accommodating Emergencies (September 2003)
49. Adrian Vermeule, The Judiciary Is a They, Not an It: Two Fallacies of Interpretive Theory (September 2003)
50. Cass R. Sunstein, Ideological Voting on Federal Courts of Appeals: A Preliminary Investigation (September 2003)
51. Bernard E. Harcourt, Rethinking Racial Profiling: A Critique of the Economics, Civil Liberties, and Constitutional Literature, and of Criminal Profiling More Generally (November 2003)
52. Jenia Iontcheva, Nationalizing International Criminal Law: The International Criminal Court As a Roving Mixed Court (January 2004)
53. Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, The Right to Destroy (January 2004)
54. Adrian Vermeule, Submajority Rules (in Legislatures and Elsewhere) (January 2004)
55. Jide Nzelibe, The Credibility Imperative: The Political Dynamics of Retaliation in the World Trade Organization's Dispute Resolution Mechanism (January 2004)
56. Catharine A. MacKinnon, Directions in Sexual Harassment Law: Afterword (January 2004)
57. Cass R. Sunstein, Black on Brown (February 2004)
58. Elizabeth F. Emens, Monogamy's Law: Compulsory Monogamy and Polyamorous Existence (February 2004)
59. Bernard E. Harcourt, You Are Entering a Gay- and Lesbian-Free Zone: On the Radical Dissents of Justice Scalia and Other (Post-) Queers (February 2004)
60. Adrian Vermeule, Selection Effects in Constitutional Law (March 2004)
61. Derek Jinks and David Sloss, Is the President Bound by the Geneva Conventions? (July 2004)
62. Derek Jinks and Ryan Goodman, How to Influence States: Socialization and International Human Rights Law (March 2004)
63. Eric A. Posner and Alan O. Sykes, Optimal War and *Jus Ad Bellum* (April 2004)
64. Derek Jinks, Protective Parity and the Law of War (April 2004)
65. Derek Jinks, The Declining Significance of POW Status (April 2004)
66. Bernard E. Harcourt, Unconstitutional Police Searches and Collective Responsibility (June 2004)
67. Bernard E. Harcourt, On Gun Registration, the NRA, Adolf Hitler, and Nazi Gun Laws: Exploding the Gun Culture Wars {A Call to Historians} (June 2004)

68. Jide Nzelibe, *The Uniqueness of Foreign Affairs* (July 2004)
69. Derek Jinks, *Disaggregating "War"* (July 2004)
70. Jill Elaine Hasday, *Mitigation and the Americans with Disabilities Act* (August 2004)
71. Eric A. Posner and Cass R. Sunstein, *Dollars and Death* (August 2004)
72. Cass R. Sunstein, *Group Judgments: Deliberation, Statistical Means, and Information Markets* (August 2004)
73. Adrian Vermeule, *Constitutional Amendments and the Constitutional Common Law* (September 2004)
74. Elizabeth Emens, *The Sympathetic Discriminator: Mental Illness and the ADA* (September 2004)
75. Adrian Vermeule, *Three Strategies of Interpretation* (October 2004)
76. Cass R. Sunstein, *The Right to Marry* (October 2004)
77. Jill Elaine Hasday, *The Canon of Family Law* (October 2004)
78. Adam M. Samaha, *Litigant Sensitivity in First Amendment Law* (November 2004)
79. Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, *A Social Networks Theory of Privacy* (December 2004)
80. Cass R. Sunstein, *Minimalism at War* (December 2004)
81. Eric A. Posner, *The Decline of the International Court of Justice* (December 2004)
82. Tim Wu, *The Breach Theory of Treaty Enforcement* (February 2005, revised March 2005)
83. Adrian Vermeule, *Libertarian Panics* (February 2005)
84. Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, *Should Coercive Interrogation Be Legal?* (March 2005)
85. Cass R. Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule, *Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life-Life Tradeoffs* (March 2005)
86. Adam B. Cox, *Partisan Gerrymandering and Disaggregated Redistricting* (April 2005)
87. Eric A. Posner, *Political Trials in Domestic and International Law* (April 2005)
88. Cass R. Sunstein, *Irreversible and Catastrophic* (April 2005)
89. Adam B. Cox, *Partisan Fairness and Redistricting Politics* (April 2005, *NYU L. Rev.* 70, #3)
90. Cass R. Sunstein, *Administrative Law Goes to War* (May 2005, *Harvard L. Rev.*, *forthcoming*)
91. Cass R. Sunstein, *Chevron Step Zero* (May 2005)
92. Bernard E. Harcourt, *Policing L.A.'s Skid Row: Crime and Real Estate Development in Downtown Los Angeles [An Experiment in Real Time]* (May 2005)
93. Bernard E. Harcourt and Jens Ludwig, *Broken Windows: New Evidence from New York City and a Five-City Social Experiment* (May 2005)
94. Bernard E. Harcourt, *Against Prediction: Sentencing, Policing, and Punishing in an Actuarial Age* (May 2005)
95. Philip Hamburger, *The New Censorship: Institutional Review Boards* (May 2005)
96. Eugene Kontorovich, *Disrespecting the "Opinions of Mankind"* (June 2005)
97. Tim Wu, *Intellectual Property, Innovation, and Decision Architectures* (June 2005)
98. Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, *Exclusionary Amenities in Residential Commons* (July 2005)
99. Cass R. Sunstein, *Ranking Law Schools: A Market Test?* (July 2005)
100. Mary Anne Case, *Pets or Meat* (August 2005)
101. Adam Samaha, *Executive Exposure: Government Secrets, Constitutional Law, and Platforms for Judicial Intervention* (August 2005, revised November 2005)
102. Jason J. Czarnezki and William K. Ford, *The Phantom Philosophy? An Empirical Investigation of Legal Interpretation* (August 2005)
103. Adrian Vermeule, *Absolute Voting Rules* (August 2005)
104. Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, *Emergencies and Democratic Failure* (August 2005)
105. Adrian Vermeule, *Reparations as Rough Justice* (September 2005)

106. Arthur J. Jacobson and John P. McCormick, *The Business of Business Is Democracy* (September 2005)
107. Tracey Meares and Kelsi Brown Corkran, *When 2 or 3 Come Together* (October 2005)
108. Adrian Vermeule, *Political Constraints on Supreme Court Reform* (October 2005)
109. Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, *Information Asymmetries and the Rights to Exclude* (November 2005)
110. Cass R. Sunstein, *Fast, Frugal and (Sometimes) Wrong* (November 2005)
111. Cass R. Sunstein, *Justice Breyer's Democratic Pragmatism* (November 2005)
112. Adam M. Samaha, *Endorsement Retires: From Religious Symbols to Anti-Sorting Principles* (November 2005)
113. Adam M. Samaha, *Undue Process: Congressional Referral and Judicial Resistance in the Schiavo Controversy* (November 2005)
114. Bernard E. Harcourt, *Should We Aggregate Mental Hospitalization and Prison Population Rates in Empirical Research on the Relationship between Incarceration and Crime, Unemployment, Poverty, and Other Social Indicators? On the Continuity of Spatial Exclusion and Confinement in Twentieth Century United States* (January 2006)
115. Elizabeth Garrett and Adrian Vermeule, *Transparency in the Budget Process* (January 2006)
116. Cass R. Sunstein, *Burkean Minimalism* (January 2006)
117. Stephanos Bibas, *Transparency and Participation in Criminal Procedure* (February 2006)
118. Douglas G. Lichtman, *Captive Audiences and the First Amendment* (February 2006)
119. Eric A. Posner and Cass R. Sunstein, *The Law of Other States* (March 2006)
120. Jeff Leslie and Cass R. Sunstein, *Animal Rights without Controversy* (March 2006)
121. Adrian Vermeule, *The Delegation Lottery* (March 2006)
122. Adrian Vermeule, *Self-Defeating Proposals: Ackerman on Emergency Powers* (March 2006)
123. Bernard E. Harcourt, *Muslim Profiles Post 9/11: Is Racial Profiling an Effective Counterterrorist Measure and Does It Violate the Right to Be Free from Discrimination?* (March 2006)
124. Christine Jolls and Cass R. Sunstein, *The Law of Implicit Bias* (April 2006)
125. Lior Strahilevitz, *"How's My Driving?" for Everyone (and Everything?)* (April 2006)
126. Jack Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner, *The New International Law Scholarship* (May 2006)
127. Eric A. Posner and John Yoo, *International Law and the Rise of China* (May 2006)
128. Eric A. Posner and Cass R. Sunstein, *Chevronizing Foreign Relations Law* (May 2006)
129. Jacob E. Gersen and Adrian Vermeule, *Chevron as a Voting Rule* (June 2006)
130. Jacob E. Gersen, *Temporary Legislation* (June 2006)
131. Adam B. Cox, *Designing Redistricting Institutions* (June 2006)
132. Adam B. Cox, *The Temporal Dimension of Voting Rights* (July 2006)
133. Curtis A. Bradley and Eric A. Posner, *Presidential Signing Statements and Executive Power* (July 2006)
134. Cass R. Sunstein, *Clear Statement Principles and National Security: Hamdan and Beyond* (July 2006)
135. Cass R. Sunstein, *Of Snakes and Butterflies: A Reply* (August 2006)
136. Cass R. Sunstein, *Montreal versus Kyoto: A Tale of Two Protocols* (September 2006)
137. Douglas Lichtman, *Irreparable Benefits* (September 2006)
138. Adam M. Samaha, *Undue Process* (September 2006)
139. Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, *The Credible Executive* (September 2006)
140. Adam B. Cox and Eric A. Posner, *The Second-Order Structure of Immigration Law* (November 2006)
141. Eric A. Posner, *The International Protection of Cultural Property: Some Skeptical Observations* (November 2006)

142. Bernard E. Harcourt and Jens Ludwig, Reefer Madness: Broken Windows Policing and Misdemeanor Marijuana Arrests in New York City, 1989–2000 (December 2006)
143. Bernard E. Harcourt, Embracing Chance: Post-Modern Meditations on Punishment (December 2006)
144. Cass R. Sunstein, Second-Order Perfectionism (December 2006)
145. Wayne Hsiung and Cass R. Sunstein, Climate Change and Animals (January 2007)
146. Cass R. Sunstein, Deliberating Groups versus Prediction Markets (or Hayek’s Challenge to Habermas) (January 2007)
147. Cass R. Sunstein, Incompletely Theorized Agreements in Constitutional Law (January 2007)
148. Eric A. Posner, Climate Change and Human Rights Litigation: A Critical Appraisal (January 2007)
149. Cass R. Sunstein, Cost-Benefit Analysis without Analyzing Costs or Benefits: Reasonable Accommodation, Balancing, and Stigmatic Harms (January 2007)
150. Cass R. Sunstein, Willingness to Pay versus Welfare (January 2007)
151. Cass R. Sunstein, If People Would Be Outraged by Their Rulings, Should Judges Care? (February 2007)
152. Bernard E. Harcourt, Judge Richard Posner on Civil Liberties: Pragmatic Authoritarian Libertarian (March 2007)
153. Eugene Kontorovich, What Standing Is Good For (March 2007)
154. Eugene Kontorovich, Inefficient Customs in International Law (March 2007)
155. Bernard E. Harcourt, From the Asylum to the Prison: Rethinking the Incarceration Revolution. Part II: State Level Analysis (March 2007)
156. Bernard E. Harcourt, An Answer to the Question: “What Is Poststructuralism?” (March 2007)
157. Cass R. Sunstein, Backlash’s Travels (March 2007)
158. Cass R. Sunstein, Due Process Traditionalism (March 2007)
159. Adam B. Cox and Thomas J. Miles, Judging the Voting Rights Act (March 2007)
160. Jonathan F. Mitchell, Apprendi’s *Domain* (April 2007)
161. Jacob E. Gersen, Overlapping and Underlapping Jurisdiction in Administrative Law (April 2007)
162. Eric A. Posner and Cass R. Sunstein, On Learning from Others (April 2007)