


# CONTENTS



<i>Prologue</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxi

## PART ONE □ FRAMEWORK

---

I. Introduction	3
II. Welfare Economics and Notions of Fairness	15
A. <i>Welfare Economics</i>	15
1. Individuals' Well-Being	18
2. Social Welfare and Individuals' Well-Being	24
3. Comments on Social Welfare and the Distribution of Income	28
4. Concluding Remark	38
B. <i>Notions of Fairness</i>	38
1. The Basic Nature of Notions of Fairness	38
2. Further Comments on Notions of Fairness	45
(a) Meaning	45
(b) Nonconsequentialist Character	47
(c) Ex Post Character	48
(d) Concluding Remark	51

<i>C. Overview of Our Argument</i>	52
1. The Argument for Welfare Economics and against Notions of Fairness	52
2. On the Rationale for Notions of Fairness	59
<i>D. Notions of Fairness and Social Norms</i>	62
1. The Nature of Social Norms	63
2. Implications for the Role of Notions of Fairness in Legal Policy Analysis	69

---

## PART TWO □ ANALYSIS

---

<b>III. Torts</b>	85
<i>A. Welfare Economics and Tort Law</i>	86
<i>B. Notions of Fairness and Tort Law</i>	86
1. Notions of Fairness	87
2. Comments on the Literature	91
<i>C. Welfare Economics versus Fairness in Paradigmatic Accident Situations</i>	99
1. Reciprocal Accidents	100
(a) Description	100
(b) Effects of the Legal Rules	101
(c) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	102
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	103
(e) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	104
(i) The Argument for Welfare Economics and against Notions of Fairness	104
(ii) Comments on the Literature	106
(iii) The Significance of the Possibility That All Individuals May Be Made Worse Off under Any Notion of Fairness	110
(f) The Apparent Mootness of Concerns for Fairness	113
2. Nonreciprocal Accidents	118
(a) Description	118
(b) Effects of the Legal Rules	118

(c) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	118
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	119
(e) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	120
<i>D. Welfare Economics versus Fairness in Paradigmatic Accident Situations: The Case in Which Harm Is Uncertain</i>	123
1. Reciprocal Accidents	124
(a) Description	124
(b) Effects of the Legal Rules	124
(c) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	125
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	125
(e) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	126
(f) The Foregoing Reconsidered When Insurance Is Not Purchased	126
(i) Victims Uninsured	126
(ii) Injurers Uninsured	129
2. Nonreciprocal Accidents	132
<i>E. The Appeal of Notions of Fairness and Its Implications</i>	134
1. Social Norms and Notions of Fairness	134
2. Implications for the Role of Notions of Fairness in Legal Policy Analysis	138
3. Remark on the Concepts of Injurer and Victim	143
4. Remark on the Ex Post Character of Notions of Fairness	147
<i>F. The Extent to Which the Use of Notions of Fairness Has Led Us Astray</i>	148
<b>IV. Contracts</b>	155
<i>A. Welfare Economics and the Enforcement of Contracts</i>	155
<i>B. Notions of Fairness and the Enforcement of Contracts</i>	156
1. Promise-Keeping	157
2. The View That Breach Is Akin to a Tort	166
3. Further Comments on the Literature	169
<i>C. Welfare Economics versus Fairness and the Enforcement of Contracts</i>	172
1. Complete Contracts	174



(a) Description	174
(b) Examination of Different Contracts	175
(c) Effects of the Legal Rules	177
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	181
(e) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	181
(f) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	182
(i) In Relation to Promise-Keeping	182
(ii) In Relation to the View That Breach Is Akin to a Tort	184
(iii) Summary	185
2. Incomplete Contracts	186
(a) Description	186
(b) Effects of the Legal Rules	187
(c) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	189
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	189
(e) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	189
(i) In Relation to Promise-Keeping	190
(ii) In Relation to the View That Breach Is Akin to a Tort	197
(f) The Apparent Mootness and Arbitrariness of Concerns for Fairness	201
(g) The Appeal of Notions of Fairness and Its Implications	203
<i>D. Additional Considerations</i>	213
1. Distribution of Income	213
2. Advantage-Taking	215
3. The Extent to Which the Use of Notions of Fairness Has Led Us Astray	221
 V. Legal Procedure	 225
A. <i>Ability to Bring Suit</i>	227
1. Welfare Economics and the Ability to Bring Suit	227
2. Notions of Fairness and the Ability to Bring Suit	228
3. Description of a Basic Case	232

4. Effects of the Legal Rules	233
5. Normative Assessment	235
(a) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	235
(b) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	236
(c) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	236
6. The Appeal of Notions of Fairness and Its Implications	241
7. Remarks on the Generality of Our Results	245
8. The Extent to Which the Use of Notions of Fairness Has Led Us Astray	246
<i>B. Accuracy in Adjudication</i>	248
1. Welfare Economics and Accuracy in Adjudication	249
2. Notions of Fairness and Accuracy in Adjudication	250
3. Basic Case: Accuracy in Assessing Damages and the Benefit of Inducing Behavior in Accordance with Legal Rules	254
(a) Description	254
(b) Effects of the Legal Rules	256
(c) Choice of Legal Rules Using Welfare Economics	257
(d) Choice of Legal Rules Using Notions of Fairness	258
(e) Why the Choice of Legal Rules Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	259
(f) The Appeal of Notions of Fairness and Its Implications	262
4. Variations: Accuracy in Determining Damages	264
(a) Case in Which Injurers Do Not Know in Advance How Much Harm Victims Will Suffer	264
(b) Case in Which Victims Are Risk Averse and Injurers Do Not Know in Advance How Much Harm Victims Will Suffer	266
5. Variations: Accuracy in Determining Liability	269
6. Remarks	272
(a) The Generality of Our Results	272
(b) Parties' Excessive Incentives to Invoke Procedures in Litigation	272



7. The Extent to Which the Use of Notions of Fairness Has Led Us Astray	273
<i>C. Additional Reasons Why Legal Procedures May Be Valued</i>	275
1. Possible Tastes for Procedural Fairness	275
2. Other Ways in Which Procedures May Enhance Individuals' Well-Being	281
<b>VI. Law Enforcement</b>	291
<i>A. Welfare Economics and Law Enforcement</i>	292
<i>B. Notions of Fairness and Law Enforcement</i>	294
1. Notions of Fairness	294
2. Comments on the Literature	303
<i>C. Welfare Economics versus Fairness and Law Enforcement</i>	317
1. Fair Punishment and Deterrence in a Paradigm Case	318
(a) Description	318
(b) Behavior of Individuals under Different Sanctions	318
(c) Choice of Sanction Using Welfare Economics	319
(d) Choice of Sanction Using Notions of Fairness	320
(e) Why the Choice of Sanction Should Be Based Only on Individuals' Well-Being	320
(i) Effects on the Well-Being of Different Groups	322
(ii) Actual Imposition of Unfair Punishment under the Two Approaches	324
(iii) Comments on the Literature	326
2. Variation of the Paradigm Case: Different Crimes	329
3. Variation of the Paradigm Case: Imperfect Deterrence	331
4. Variation of the Paradigm Case: Punishment of the Innocent	336
(a) Analysis of a Basic Situation	336
(b) Comments on the Literature	339
<i>D. The Appeal of Notions of Fairness and Its Implications</i>	352
1. The Origins and Functions of Notions of Fairness	353
2. Implications for the Role of Notions of Fairness in Legal Policy Analysis	359
3. Remark on the Ex Post Character of Notions of Fairness	372
<i>E. The Extent to Which the Use of Notions of Fairness Has Led Us Astray</i>	373

## PART THREE □ EXTENSIONS

VII. On the Use of Notions of Fairness and Welfare Economics by Different Types of Actors	381
A. <i>Ordinary Individuals</i>	382
B. <i>Legal Academics</i>	383
1. The Appeal of Notions of Fairness to Legal Academics	383
2. Why Legal Academics Should Be Guided by Welfare Economics	389
3. Reminder of the Ways in Which Notions of Fairness Are Relevant for Legal Policy Analysis under Welfare Economics	394
C. <i>Government Decisionmakers</i>	396
VIII. Comments on the Breadth and Soundness of Welfare Economics	403
A. <i>Design of Legal Institutions</i>	404
1. Accuracy	405
2. Controlling Government Officials' Behavior	406
3. Legitimacy of Legal Institutions	407
4. Administrative Costs	408
B. <i>Preferences and Individuals' Well-Being</i>	409
1. Imperfect Information and Other Limitations on Individuals' Decisionmaking	410
2. The Effect of the Law on Preferences	413
3. Trumping Objectionable Preferences	418
4. Tastes for Notions of Fairness	431
C. <i>Bad Luck and Inequality</i>	436
1. Bad Luck: Ex Ante versus Ex Post Evaluation	437
2. Equality and Equal Treatment	444
D. <i>Additional Concerns about the Application of Welfare Economics</i>	449
1. Difficulty in Valuing Life, Pain and Suffering, and Other Nonpecuniary Factors	450
2. Omission of "Soft" Variables	454
3. Possible Costs of Permitting Market Trade	455

---

4. Indeterminacy	457
(a) Indeterminacy Due to Empirical Uncertainty	457
(b) Conceptual Indeterminacy	458
5. The Difficulty of Predicting the Behavior of Individuals, Who Are Not Always Rational Maximizers of Their Own Well-Being	461
 IX. Conclusion	 465
 <i>References</i>	 475
<i>Index</i>	511