Lectures on Tu-Thu from 2:00 pm - 3:30 pm over zoom at <a href="https://berkeley.zoom.us/j/93377580666?pwd=eHhRdWpwUTF5Rm1SczRjZW9YVUZCZz09">https://berkeley.zoom.us/j/93377580666?pwd=eHhRdWpwUTF5Rm1SczRjZW9YVUZCZz09</a>, Meeting ID: 933 7758 0666, Passcode: 223265, or in person at Anthro/Art Practice Bldg. 155 with Bruno Meyerhof Salama, <a href="mailto:brunosalama@law.berkeley.edu">brunosalama@law.berkeley.edu</a>. The first two weeks of instruction are expected to take place exclusively over zoom.

**Office Hours** on Mondays 9-10am via Skype. To schedule a meeting, just add brunosalama18 over Skype and send a message.

**GSI** is Alex Huang, alexwong @berkeley.edu.

**Summary.** The economic analysis of law is one of the major theoretical perspectives in the study of law in American universities. Law and Economics I (Legal Studies 145) addresses the economics of core Common Law topics such as property, contract and tort law. Law and Economics II (Legal Studies 147) complements that introduction by addressing topics such as corporate, family, and antitrust law, among others, as well as by engaging with some of the debates that sustain the vitality of the field of Law and Economics.

**Bibliography.** No need to buy books. Readings are available online or through bcourses.

## Grading.

Two reflection papers: 35% of total grade each (see instructions). Homework: 20%. Students should turn in 5 quizzes. Each quiz corresponds to 4% of your total grade. The quizzes and their due dates will be made available during the semester. Participation in discussion sections: 10%.

## Sequence (tentative).

A. The building blocks: rationality, efficiency, incentives

<ol> <li>2.</li> </ol>	Rational choice and the law  Market coordination and wealth maximization	David Friedman, What Does Economics Have to Do with Law?, at <a href="http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws_Order_draft/laws_order_ch_1.htm">http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws_Order_draft/laws_order_ch_1.htm</a> David Friedman, Efficiency and All That, at <a href="http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws_Order_draft/laws_order_ch_2.htm">http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws_Order_draft/laws_order_ch_2.htm</a>
B.	Regulation and externalities	
<ul><li>3.</li><li>4.</li></ul>	Coordination and the law  Coasean law and economics	David Friedman, What's Wrong with the World, Part 1, at <a href="http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws">http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws</a> Order draft/laws order ch 3.htm  David Friedman, What's Wrong with the World, Part 2, at <a href="http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws">http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws</a> Order draft/laws
		order_ch_4.htm
C.	Production: market vs. hierarchy	
5.	Economics of corporate law	Richard Posner, Economic Analysis of Law, 9 <sup>th</sup> ed. (2014), pp. 533-544 (pdf at bcourses)

Posner EAL 9<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 548-555 (pdf at bcourses) 6. Bankruptcy law

D. Are people rational?

7. The challenge of behavioral Thomas S. Ulen, The Importance of Behavioral Law, in economics The Oxford Handbook of Behavioral Law and Economics

93 (Eyal Zamir & Doron Teichman eds.) 2014. Access

through UCB library.

8. Do ideas matter? The case of David Friedman, Marriage, Sex and Babies,

http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws\_Order\_draft/laws\_ family law

order ch 13.htm

E. Is Law and Economics conservative?

9. Love over the Common Law David Friedman, Is the Common Law Efficient?, at

http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Laws Order draft/laws

order\_ch\_19.htms

10. Readings of the Coase Theorem Nicholas Mercuro and Steven G. Medema, Economics and

> the Law: From Posner to Postmodernism and Beyond, Princeton University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 2020, p. 107-113 (pdf

at bcourses)

F. Should law and econ focus on distribution alongside efficiency?

11. The wealth maximization principle Richard A. Posner, Wealth Maximization Revisited, 2

Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy 85

(1985)

12. The technical debate Robert Cooter and Thomas Ulen, Law & Economics, 6th

> ed., 2016, pp. 7-8; Robert Cooter, Law and Unified Social Theory, 22 Journal of Law and Society 50 (1995), pp. 57-

58 (available online)

G. Innovation in Law and Econ

and its discontents

Robert Cooter and Aaron Edlin, The Falcon's Gyre: Legal 13. Static or dynamic efficiency?

Foundations of Economic Innovation and Growth, 2014,

Preface and chapter 1 (available at

https://lawcat.berkeley.edu/record/1126190?ln=en)

14. What role for antitrust? Herbert Hovenkamp, The Looming Crisis in Antitrust

Economics 101 Boston University Law Review 489

(2021)

H. Conclusion

15. Does economics increase Eric Posner, Economic Analysis of Contract Law after objectivity in law?

Three Decades: Success or Failure?, 112 Yale Law Journal 829 (2003). Read introduction (pp. 829-832) and

item I.F (Impossibility, pp. 848-849)

Bruno Meyerhof Salama, Law and Macroeconomics as 16. Should there be a law and macroeconomics?

Mainstream: Review Essay of Yair Listokin, Law and

Macroeconomics: Legal Remedies for Recessions (Uni of Toronto Law Journal, 2020)

This sequence will be adjusted to accommodate pace of online discussions, topics of students' interest and other circumstances. Any changes will be announced in class and posted on the course website.

\* \* \*

## Instructions for the reflection paper.

- The reflection paper consists of a critique (that is, a comment) to one of the readings mentioned in this syllabus.
- Some samples have been posted online.
- You must include your student ID and the reading's title in the file name (e.g. Critique of Wealth Maximization CalID)
- Size: between 700 and 1,000 words.
- Deadlines (tentatively):
  - o March 27, 2022
  - o May 12, 2022
- Format. Use 12-point Times New Roman, 1.5 spaced with 1-inch margins.
- Don't forget to write your name and section number at the top of the front page.

#### Frequent questions about the reflection paper.

- 1. What are you looking for? Papers should briefly summarize the reading or the aspect of the reading you are concerned with but not simply summarize. I am interested in your thoughts upon the reading or upon a specific idea contained in the reading and (ideally) also explored in class. Your paper should have one main idea/argument, spelled out at the outset of the paper and developed throughout. Possible strategies include (but are not limited to) the following:
  - Contrast an idea developed in the selected reading with topics or ideas developed in other parts of the syllabus or in other classes you took at UC Berkeley or elsewhere.
  - Find an application that seemingly proves or disproves the point made in the reading, such as a new or old law, court holding or policy.
  - Compare a standard legal view to the one developed based on the economic standpoint.
  - Discuss a technological innovation that challenges or confirm a point made in the reading.
- 2. Do you want us to summarize the main arguments in the readings before providing our analysis? That often helps us assess your comprehension of the readings and also helps the flow of the paper but given the paper's length you should do so briefly.
- 3. There are several factors that students must trade-off against each other in defining their main argument. For example, students can choose between: creative thinking; detailed analysis of a specific policy design; broader implications/generalizations that come out of the readings; criticizing the approach or perspective given by a particular author (pointing out the flaws in the paper). Do you have a preference? No, I don't. Creative and critical thinking is what I am looking for, but it will only get a high grade if is well supported and articulated.

4. How much time should we spend on citations, page numbers, using quotations? Not much. We are more concerned with ideas and how well you articulate them. However, it is important for you to clearly separate what is coming from the readings and what is part of your own thinking and to avoid plagiarism at all costs.

# **Grading rubric**

Understanding and Creativity of Topic: How clearly and thoroughly you demonstrate your						
understanding of your topic	lac	п				
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent				
The student fails to justify, or poorly		The student demonstrates an				
justifies, their opinion and	understanding of their topic, using	excellent, clear understanding of				
demonstrates a poor understanding	research material to provide coherent					
of their topic, presenting ideas about	support for arguments in the paper.	number of arguments in the				
key concepts in an incoherent or		paper. There is depth and				
confusing manner.		breadth in those arguments,				
		which are made coherently.				
Structure, Clarity, and Cohesion: 1	How clearly you articulate arguments					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent				
The paper is organized incoherently.	The paper is organized coherently.	The structure of the paper is				
Thoughts are disorganized. It is not	There is a clear structure, including	excellent, and ideas are				
clear what the thesis of the paper is,	an identifiable thesis and logical	articulated concisely and				
and/or there is significant disconnect	flow, but some aspects of the paper	intuitively, in an ordered				
between the arguments and the	are unclear or poorly structured.	manner. There is a clear				
thesis.		introduction, thesis, and				
		conclusion, with a logical and				
		coherent flow of argumentation				
		throughout the paper.				
Opposing Arguments and Persuasi	veness: How thoroughly you address.					
against your opinion	······································	,,,				
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent				
The student demonstrates a poor	The student makes at least one	The student demonstrates a good				
understanding of opposing	supported counter-argument, and	understanding of a number of				
arguments, either failing to present	refutes that argument systematically	opposing arguments, presenting				
them at all, or presenting them in an	and coherently.	them coherently, and with				
incoherent manner.	and concremity.	appropriate evidence. The				
medicient mainier.		student refutes these arguments				
		systematically and convincingly.				
Descarch and Thoroughness, How	well you integrate appropriate and co					
_	wen you integrate appropriate and co	impening research into your				
paper	G	E H				
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent				
The paper is poorly and narrowly	The paper is referenced adequately	Arguments in the paper are				
referenced. If research is included at		comprehensively and accurately				
all, it is in an incoherent or confusing		referenced. There is broad				
manner.	although the integration of this	integration of compelling				
	information is neither exhaustive nor					
	seamless.	information is intuitive and				
		seamless. Notice: relying				
		primarily on class materials is				

		fine.			
Grammar and Citations: How concise, free of typos/spelling errors, and grammatically correct your					
paper 1s					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent			
Grammar /spelling are poor.	G&S are of a good standard.	G&S are mostly flawless.			

**How this rubric relates to your paper grade:** You can assume that a paper receiving Unsatisfactory scores will receive a C or below, a paper that Satisfactorily meets the requirements of the assignment will receive in the B range, and an Excellent paper will receive in the A range.

#### **Final observations:**

- Thoroughness: your paper gets better as you research more on the topic.
- **Clarity**: take time to review/rewrite your paper and ensure that there are no grammatical errors.
- Creativity: write something that is not completely obvious.
- Cohesion: write arguments that don't contradict each other.
- Citations: cite your sources in footnotes that can be easily accessed by the professor.

#### END OF DOCUMENT