
Friedrich Nietzsche (1878) once wrote, “The irrationality of a thing is no argument against its existence, rather a condition of it.” Since the inception of Adam Smith’s invisible hand, economics has largely been guided by rational choice theories that advance the notion that the logical pursuit of self-interest drives human choice in a free society and leads to prosperity. However, although proponents of rational choice are quick to remember the notions of empirical economics that have been set forth from Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*, it is often forgotten that Smith’s work was predicated on a philosophy that justice and other moral virtues limit the pursuit of self-interest (Kilcullen 1996a). In his other great work, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Smith provides an analysis of various feelings and psychological conditions relating to morality and invites the reader to test his ideas against the personal experience of these feelings (Kilcullen 1996b). This reliance on psychology by the greatest economic mind of our times might lead a person to believe that the world historically would have been more influenced by a broader set of social factors. However, until recently, economic thought has largely focused on the empirical study of self-interest that leads to utility functions, supply and demand curves, and Pareto optimal solutions. It is only more recently that the findings of behavioral economists have raised some doubts on the previously unquestioned assumptions of human rationality and have made large inroads into this discipline.

Behavioral economists accept many of the premises of traditional economic thought, for example, that situational outcomes are the result of individual decisions, taking place in a particular economic environment. But behavioral economists go a step further, arguing that the human action not only is shaped by relevant economic constraints but is highly affected by people’s endogenous preferences, knowledge, skills, endowments, and a variety of psychological and

market values to realize the relevance of behavioral analyses in policy and discourse. In academic analyses, the relevance of these tools spans from understanding of microbehavior to general equilibrium theory. For example, no longer could the value of assets be determined simply by the financial equilibrium of the market. Rather, a combination of emotions and heightened attention in the market, fed by the optimistic cheerleading of pundits, led to an excessive demand to “get into the game” (Shiller 2000). But behavioral and experimental economics, a unique blend of psychology, economics, and neuroscience can explain much of the overvaluing of stocks. In many ways it offers an analytical opening where mainstream economic models have failed. The former theory may help answer questions such as why Americans save too little, acquire too much debt, and age their investment portfolios in a self-destructive fashion (Dubner 2003).

The rise of behavioral economics and the findings of experimental economics, however, have led to a clash between the rational choice theory and the behavioral theory. This idea does not properly account for the montage of human emotions, beliefs, and attitudes. One anonymous economist has been quoted as saying, “What we have to understand is that behavioral economics is attacking the foundation of what welfare economics is built on.”

However, it may be possible to end the intellectual tug-of-war between rational choice theorists and behavioralists without turning it into a zero-sum game. In the present text, twenty-eight authors have joined together to present such a partnership. Covering a wide range of fields from neuroscience to economics to law and psychology, these distinguished academics have presented an array of valuable contributions that, aware in their own application that rational choice theory can no longer be bought in a wholesale fashion, aim at revisiting its basic premises in a way as to ensure a more rigorous analytical model. These authors then proceed to offer a practical application of this modified theory to a variety of economic and legal problems that have bedeviled traditional economic thought.

These chapters offer an important contribution to the ongoing research program, incorporating the findings of psychology and other behavioral sciences to reevaluate more systematically the process of human choice and the structure of human judgment and well-being. These sciences, while revealing important differences between traditional economic assumptions and the process of

In the first set of chapters, the authors provide the intellectual foundation for behavioral theory that questions many of the assumptions of rational choice. Contributions range from reviews of mainstream research on biases in judgment and uncertainty to more radical challenges to the economic model of human behavior, such as critiques of the familiar assumptions about preference and choice. Building on the idea of bounded rationality, these authors argue that rational choice theory fails to account for everyday experiences. Why, for example, are millions of dollars given away anonymously if people are only driven by rational, self-interest impulses? Why do some humans find themselves incapable of controlling destructive impulses that lead them to choices they know are not in their own interest? These questions can be answered in a variety of ways. Psychology instructs us that the needs of human reality impose cognitive limits on human behavior that restrict inputs into the decision-making process, leading to seemingly irrational choices. Neuroscience teaches us that the structure and activity of the brain influence human choices and that physiological damage can radically alter decisions and perceptions of rationality. Other ideas, such as prospect theory and optimism bias that result in the misperception of odds and risks, are evaluated as factors that likewise limit the process of rational choice.

The chapters in this section lay the analytical groundwork that is needed to understand from an economic perspective why humans frequently behave in an irrational fashion. Rather than simply dismiss rational choice theory as an intellectual failure, these authors explain some of the weaknesses that have confronted traditional economic analysis and offer theoretical models that will help rectify some of these inconsistencies.

Robert Frank argues that the analytical power of pure rational choice theory is compromised, because it fails to adequately address the cognitive errors that are part of everyday human experience, it does not address the impulse-control problem of many individuals that will drive a person to make a seemingly irrational choice, and its premise that humans always make self-interested choices does not explain the voluminous number of anonymous charitable donations that are made each year. Frank puts forth the adaptive rationality standard, that is, a person chooses efficient means to achieve an end, but the person's goals are not a

enzer argues that the methodology of human choice must be understood in light of the constraints on reason that our own minds impose on us. In order to truly understand the heuristics or decision-making processes utilized by individuals, one must consider not only the cognitive process of people but the environmental constraints and limitations in which the decision-making process occurs. Gigerenzer examines several different heuristic devices that individuals use to limit the amount of cognitive information that goes into reaching decisions, including one-reason-based decisions, a preference for recognizable outcomes, and so forth. Gigerenzer concludes that these devices, which take into account humanity's cognitive limitations, have a strong predictive ability in regard to human choice.

Kevin McCabe, Vernon Smith, and Terrence Chorvat argue that the behavioral economics field would be intellectually strengthened if more consideration were given to the arising field of neuroeconomics. Neuroeconomics is defined by the authors as the use of technology such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scans to determine which area of the human brain is used when making economic decisions. The authors maintain that there is a great deal of heterogeneity among humans in terms of their perception and cognition of different economic circumstances. Thus, if one gains a solid understanding of which parts of the brain are used to make particular decisions, a predictive function can be achieved. The authors further concludes by surveying the field of potential practical applications of neuroeconomics to the law, including contract law, property law, choice of law, business associations, and the study of juries.

The authors of the first three chapters in this section attempt to examine how human psychology affects outcome choices. Robert Cooter rounds out this section by examining the reverse question: How do the choices we make, such as the laws we abide by, change our values? Cooter argues that we choose laws to serve certain ends, but the eventual result is that those very laws change who we are as people and what values we hold.

THE ECONOMICS OF IRRATIONAL BEHAVIOR

In the second section, the analysis extends to a broader examination of how irrational behavior affects our everyday economic decisions. Contributions from

notion that alcoholism is a biological disease triggered by consumption. Skog argues that something of an economic approach, maintaining that addiction must be understood as choice, though not necessarily a rational one. Skog argues that we should show several components of irrational thinking and decision making, including unstable preferences and inconsistencies between short-term and long-term preferences. Skog reasons that choice is best understood in the area of addiction in terms of rational choice's insistence on stable preferences and accept that preferences vary based on environmental factors.

Just as addiction can lead to irrational behavior, so can other factors and conditions, such as a desire for revenge and retaliation. Authors Vincy Fon and Francesco Parisi posit that norms of negative reciprocity have been present in human civilizations and have played an important evolutionary role in human development. Humans are guided by an innate sense of fairness that drives their actions, attitudes, and behaviors. By constraining the actions of revenge that are born from this sense of fairness, a net social benefit can be achieved.

Building on the framework of negative reciprocity such as retaliation, Elster, Hoffman, Kevin McCabe, and Vernon Smith endeavor to provide an empirical foundation for understanding how reciprocity allows for trade. The authors argue that in situations where trading partners are familiar to each other, the actors use techniques of positive reciprocity to ensure fair behavior and to achieve the desired outcome. However, in trading environments characterized by unfamiliar players, the actors will rely on the option of punishing a defector to ensure success in negotiations and adherence to agreements.

The authors of the first three chapters in this section began the process of defining the larger thematic notions of behavioral economics and applying them to everyday choices, human interactions, and so forth. Marco Novarese and Sara Rizzello offer a methodological approach to examining these theories in practice. The authors set forth an experiment that investigates the interaction between individual aspirations and decision making in an environment characterized by uncertainty and limited information.

F. H. Buckley concludes this section by taking the very light subject of labor and showing how it too can be analyzed with the economic tools employed by the other authors in this book. Buckley presents as an economic market the situation

The third section of the book builds on the contributions of the previous sections to consider how the understanding of human choice and the departures from the assumptions of rational choice affect the idea of law as a behavioral instrument and the design of legal and judicial institutions.

Contributions examine the implications that irrationality and limited rationality have for our jurisprudential system. How should courts confront the mentally ill given that the assumption of rationality cannot always hold? What alterations must be made to the criminal justice system in light of this? Should the premise of the criminal sanction be altered to account for the fact that not all choices are the product of well thought out, rational decision making?

Stephen Morse begins the section with a broad overview of mental health law, finding a common thread in the notion that some people with mental disorders are treated specially by our legal system because they appear to lack the capacity to reason. Morse begins by examining the notion of the individual and legal responsibility, with particular emphasis on how people who are mentally ill are treated by the legal system. Morse argues that instead of adopting a new body of law specifically with mental health, mental disorders should instead be used as evidentiary tools that bear on the question of whether an individual in a given situation possessed the capacity to reason.

The next three chapters expand the role that irrationality plays in shaping criminal jurisprudence beyond the bounds of mental health law, to cover its application to criminal sanctions for the community at large. Christine Jolls examines the cognitive failures of humans, such as the optimism bias, and reasons that these failures should be considered when drafting law enforcement policies, or they will not result in maximum detection and deterrence at minimum cost. These failures help explain why policies such as prohibitions against employment discrimination have failed to always change societal and human behavior. Michael O'Neill continues the examination of the interaction between cognitive limits and criminal sanctions, reasoning that perfectly rational decisions are inhibited because individuals do not have access to all information necessary to make the fully rational choice. Accordingly, O'Neill concludes that policy makers must take irrationality into consideration, because typical methods of punishment will often not deter misbehavior.

Jonathan Caulkins and Robert MacCoun offer a very practical application of

stein argues that strong emotions such as outrage often result in inconsistent irrational punishments and jury awards, because it is hard to translate outrage into coherent legal terms and norms. Once policy makers are armed with a better understanding of this, rules can be structured for maximum deterrence. Continuing the endeavor to shape a proper system of sanctions, Yuval Feldman and John MacCoun endeavor to answer the question of how and when norms arise and how the process of individual internalization of norms occurs. The authors conclude that norms cannot be viewed as arising from a single source and that policymakers hoping to use norms to affect behavior must understand the multiplicity of the origin of norms as well as the factors that moderate the application of norms to a particular individual's life.

IRRATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND THE DESIGN OF LAW

The final section of the book offers specific policy applications of the theory of bounded rationality. The analytical framework presented by the authors provides insights into a diverse range of human problems, such as traffic safety, tort law, contract law, and securities regulation.

Thomas Ulen reviews the literature and arguments of both rational choice theorists and behavioral economists and how these ideas would present potential solutions to reduce the social costs of traffic accidents. Ulen maintains that policymakers must accept the limited rationality of its citizens. As a result, policy makers and regulators should favor technological innovations over approaches such as speed limits in achieving enhanced traffic safety.

Mark Grady examines a legal oddity that states that irrational and negligent people should be treated the same in terms of liability for their own actions. However, the same does not hold true for persons who are accused of prompting another party to act dangerously. Grady reconciles this apparent discrepancy by explaining that tort law must be understood not as promoting corrective justice in a traditional sense but as focusing liability where it will have the greatest impact, on responsible people. Understanding the rules that are used to encourage responsible behavior and to curb the excesses of irresponsible persons is necessary to having a full understanding of the tort system.

fect behavior if individuals are either optimistic or insensitive to actual probabilities. Posner reasons that when rules such as negligence and strict liability are used to correct inaccurate perceptions of probability, they will result in levels of liability that exceed the socially optimal outcome. Posner concludes the chapter by expanding the reach of his discussion to include its potential application to other areas, such as contract law.

Oren Bar-Gill and Omri Ben-Shahar argue that in the realm of contract law, courts should alter the traditional rules of contract modification and uphold modification as long as the threat that led to their adoption was credible. The authors maintain that this should be the case, even if the credible threat seems irrational, as there are a wide variety of situations in which an economic actor would want to threaten an irrational breach of contract. By failing to uphold modification under these circumstances, the authors believe courts would not lessening the occurrence of irrational conduct but would only hamper the choice of the parties, forcing them to accept breach instead of modification.

The last two chapters examine the role that irrationality plays in the regulation of the securities markets and investing. Peter Huang maintains that emotions play a strong role in investing decisions. Frequently, emotions diverge from cognition, and it is the former that often drives behavior. Emotional responses by investors have particular salience because of a line of securities regulations that mandate a broad swath of public disclosure by companies. Emotional reactions to these disclosures can lead investors to make unsound decisions. Understanding the role of emotions in investing and, in particular, the emotional reaction to mandatory disclosure is vital in creating appropriate securities regulation.

Jeffrey Rachlinski and Gregory La Blanc believe that investors need more than what cognition alone provides in order to make the decisions that result in an efficient market. The authors maintain that if investors acted solely in a non-cognitive way, they would withhold noncognitive information that the market separately needs and would hamper the market's liquidity. As a result, the authors believe that many reforms aimed at protecting investors from the cost of their cognitive mistakes (that is, structuring the tax code to favor pooled investments, individual accounts, curbing Internet investing, and so forth) must be weighed in light of the potential negative effects they could have on the market, not in terms of their protection of the individual investor.

for such predictions. In recent years, mainstream economics has begun to take notice of the intellectual and practical relevance of departures from rational choice. In 2001, George Akerlof, Michael Spence, and Joseph Stiglitz were awarded the Nobel Prize in economics for arguing that markets don't always act efficiently because buyers and sellers don't always have access to the information they need to make optimal choices (Hillsenrath 2003). The same year, Matthew Rabin was awarded the John Bates Clark Medal for his efforts to expand the realm of economics to include behavioral psychology (Maclay 2001). In 2002, Daniel Kahneman and Vernon Smith were awarded the Nobel Prize in economics for their respective contributions to behavioral economics and experimental economics. This mainstreaming of behavioral theory and the ongoing process of incorporation of psychological findings in the process of economic modeling show the intellectual power of these ideas.

This intellectual undertaking is unavoidably destined to engage several generations of scholars, given the complexity of real-world human choice relative to the simplifications of early rational choice approaches. It will be a fascinating and challenging undertaking, which has the potential of generating a vast array of policy implications in the fields of law and institutional design. This volume takes a step in this direction by bringing together the contribution of scholars who are pioneering in this field, along with a presentation of some of the most exciting developments and relevant implications for legal and economic theory.

This volume explores the most relevant developments at the interface of economics and psychology. With special attention to models of irrational behavior, it draws the relevant implications of such models for the design of legal rules and institutions. It is hoped that this will offer a starting point for how this discussion can continue in the applied field of law and economics. The findings of this volume reveal that the application of economic models of irrational behavior to law is particularly challenging because specific departures from rational behavior differ significantly from one another. Furthermore, the analytical and deductive instruments of economic theory have to be reshaped to deal with the fragmented and heterogeneous findings of psychological research, turning toward a more experimental and inductive methodology.