

Index

- abnormally dangerous
 - as test for non-reciprocal risks, 154
 - as unreasonable activity level decisions, 158
- Abraham, Kenneth S.
 - on decision making in *Vincent*, 189
 - on duty to investigate, 165
 - on property rights in *Vincent*, 183
- activity-level decisions
 - explained, 160
 - in analyzing *Hammontree*, 19
- Adams v. Bullock*, 137
 - as activity level case, 163
- affirmative duty, 120
- agency relationship
 - supplier obligations, 215
- Akerlof, George A.
 - and product liability, 209
- altruism
 - as element of social cohesion, 111
 - distinguished from self-interest, 8
- analytical framework for torts, 242–7
- Andrews, Judge
 - and duty to world, 115
- assault
 - and the negligence concept, 228
- autonomy
 - and intentional torts, 230
 - as justification for *Vincent*, 191
 - as limitation on duty, 109
 - shaping other-regarding behavior, 112
- baby on the tracks
 - as “no-duty” paradigm, 105
 - problem of ambiguity, 112
- backward and forward looking, 72
- Baird, Douglas G.
 - game theory, 35
- battery
 - and negligence, 228, 232
 - and reasonableness, 232
- Batts v. Tow-Motor Forklift Co.*
 - open and obvious dangers, 203
- behavioral science
 - law as behavioral science, 239
 - role in social cohesion, 15
- benefits principle
 - as applied to *Vincent*, 188
- Berg v. Reaction Motors Div*
 - as reasonableness case, 167
- Berry v. Sugar Notch Borough*, 135, 142
- Bethel v. New York City Transit Authority*
 - and duty to inspect, 166, 202
 - decreasing utmost standard of care, 56
- Bicchieri, Cristina
 - game theory, 35
- Binmore, Ken
 - distinguishing empathy from sympathy, 42
 - on Pareto efficiency, 67
 - on social cohesion, 15
 - on social morality, 13
- blameworthiness
 - distinguished from fault, 54
- blasting
 - as activity level decision, 161
- Blyth v. Birmingham Waterworks Co.*, 137
- Bohlen, Francis
 - incomplete privileges, 186
- Bolton v. Stone*
 - and residual risk, 175
 - as activity-level decision, 164

- bounded rationality
 - as justification for proximate cause, 138
- Brown v. Shyne*
 - as frequency case, 172
- Brudner, Alan
 - arguing against strict liability, 176
- burden of precautions
 - in *Vincent case*, 187
- burden of proof
 - as alternative to strict liability, 156
- burdens and benefits
 - correct matching in *Vincent*, 184, 188
 - in corrective justice, 100
- Byrne v. Boadle*
 - and compliance errors, 52
- Calabresi, Guido
 - and duty to investigate, 166
 - cost of accidents as broader question, 65
- Cardi, Jonathan
 - duty wars, 106
- Cardozo, Benjamin, 113
 - and *Palsgraf*, 141
- Castro v. QVC Network, Inc.*
 - and duty to investigate, 210
- categorical imperative
 - and other-regarding obligation, 77, 80
 - as method of deciding, 77
 - relation to duty, 107
- caveat emptor*
 - in development of service liability, 201
 - in product liability, 203
- choice
 - and duty, 113
 - as a poor justification for *Vincent*, 185
 - as measure of responsibility, 109
- Coase, H.R.
 - his theorem as veil of ignorance, 66
- Cohen v. Petty*, 108
- Coleman, Jules L.
 - and justifications, xiii
 - justification for *Vincent*, 183
 - on proximate cause, 129
 - on reciprocal risks, 153
 - proximate cause as responsibility, 134
- Complete Family Care v. Sprinkle*, 167
- compliance errors
 - analyzed, 47–55
 - and manufacturing defects, 48, 212
 - manufacturer and physician defects, 213
- concept of law
 - as behavioral science, 237
 - analyzed, xx–xxii
- conditional privilege
 - and *Vincent*, 186
- control
 - as measure of responsibility, 109
- coordination problem
 - and veil of ignorance, 92
 - as problem of torts, 3–4, 5–6
 - norms as solution, 34
- corrective justice
 - and aggregation, 71
 - and law and economics, 70
 - indeterminacy of, xiii
 - limited responsibility for proximate cause, 139
 - nature of interpersonal comparisons, 99
 - Ripstein perspective, xiv
- Cover v. Cohen*
 - and duty to investigate, 210
- Cruz v. Middlekauf Lincoln-Mercury, Inc.*
 - and enabling torts, 121
- Cunis v. Brennan*, 137
- Dari-Mattiaci, Guiseppe
 - on frequency decisions, 168
- decision making
 - and proximate cause, 135
 - and reasonable person, 12
 - as focus of reasonableness inquiry, 11
 - as source of responsibility in *Vincent*, 189
 - as unit of analysis, 239
- Derdarian v. Felix Contracting*, 142
- direct
 - as test for proximate cause, 130
- distributive justice
 - and enterprise liability, 158
 - distinguished from corrective justice, 99
- Dobbs, Dan B.
 - and proximate cause, 128
 - conditional fault, 186
 - misfeasance/nonfeasance, 106
 - on reasonable person, 24
 - res ipsa loquitur*, 175
- Donoghue v. Stevenson*
 - and other-regarding theory, 5
- Donohue, John J.
 - on activity levels, 164
- Doughty v. Turner Manufacturing Co.*
 - and lesser included expected harm, 148
- Dudley v. Smith*
 - and utmost care, 202
- duty
 - absence of analytical content, 107
 - as output not input, xv

Index

251

- debates over, 106
- of easy rescue, 105
- risk created by others, 117
- unity of concept, 117
- when defendant created risk, 114–15
- duty to investigate, 165
- duty to rescue
 - as result avoided in *Vincent*, 191
- Dworkin, Ronald
 - approach to Hand formula, 26
 - on comparing well-being, 26
- easy rescue
 - and duty, 105
 - problem of ambiguity, 112
- efficiency
 - socially constructed, 71
- Elgin, Aurora and Southern Traction Co. v. Wilson*, 144
- empathy
 - and responsibilities of landlord, 40
 - and thin-skull rule, 40
 - as requirement of reasonable person, 38–41
- enabling torts
 - determining duty, 121
- enterprise liability
 - as a rational for strict liability, 157
 - endorsed in one setting, 215
 - two meanings, 198
- Epstein, Richard A., 150
 - on no-duty rules, 109
- Ergon, Inc. v. Amoco Oil Co.*, 173
- Escola v. Coca Cola Bottling Co.*
 - as activity-level decision, 164
 - as heightened standard of care, 204
- Esper, Dilan A.
 - on duty, 106
- evidentiary theory
 - for strict liability, 155
- externalities
 - as output not input, xvii
- false imprisonment
 - and negligence, 229, 233
 - and reasonableness, 233
- fault
 - and obligations of suppliers, 222
- First Nat. Bank and Trust Corp. v. American Eurocopter Corp.*
 - on open and obvious dangers, 203
- Fletcher, George
 - and reciprocal risks, 153
 - justification for *Vincent*, 189
 - on frequency of activity, 169
- Flint v. Norwich & N.Y. Transp. Co.*
 - and utmost care, 202
- foreseeability
 - as test for proximate cause, 130
- frequency decisions
 - analyzed, 168
- Fried, Charles
 - approach to welfare economics, 65
- Frudkin, Noah E.
 - on social cohesion, 14
- Gardner, John
 - and strict liability, 176
- Geistfeld, Mark A.
 - and reciprocal risks, 153
 - disputing risk spreading, 157
 - justification for *Vincent*, 185
 - knowledge in intentional torts, 227
 - on *Escola*, 164, 204
 - on strict product liability, 195
 - on trade-off in torts, xix
 - evidentiary rational for strict liability, 155
- Gilles, Stephen G.
 - on activity levels, 170, 171
 - on valuation, 26
- Goldberg, John C.P.
 - distinguishing wrong from wrongdoing, 134
 - on duty, xv, 106, 116
- Grady, Mark F.
 - and compliance errors, 47, 49
 - deterrence and proximate cause, 133
 - on deterrence, 47, 48, 49
 - on proximate cause generally, 130
- Green, Michael D.
 - duty wars, 106
- Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc.*
 - and shift to defects, 195
- Grodley, James
 - justification for *Vincent*, 185
- Guille v. Swan*
 - as activity-level decision, 162
- Hammontree v. Jenner*
 - as example of coordination problem, 4
- Hand formula
 - and compliance errors, 47
 - and corrective justice, 31
 - and economic perspective, 31
 - and other-regarding behavior, 29–31
 - and responsibility, 108

- Hand formula (*cont.*)
 applied, 37–45
 as center of debate, 25
 as coordinating device, 30
 as incomplete justification, 31
 in determining duty, 123
 in relation to *Hammontree*, 18
- Hardin, Garrett
 and coordination problems, 6
- Hay v. Cohoes Co.*, 161
- Hayek, F. A.
 information and product liability, 209
- Heaven v. Pender*
 and duty to world, 115
- Henderson, James A.
 duty to investigate, 165
- Hentschel v. Baby Bathinette Corp.*
 limiting manufacturer duty, 203
- Hirschhoff, John T.
 and duty to investigate, 166
- Holmes, Oliver Wendell
 and morality of law, 55
 on strict liability, 155
 scope of responsibility, 177
- Homac Corp. v. Sun Oil Co.*
 distinguished from proximate cause, 132
- Home Office v. Dorset Yacht Co.*, 144
- Horwitz, Morton
 political basis for proximate cause, 132
- Hughes v. Lord Advocate*
 analyzed, 147
- Hylton, Keith N.
 liability as a tax, 177
 on strict liability, 163, 169
- Hynes v. New York Central Railroad Co.*
 analyzed, 148
- In re Polemis*
 and lesser included expected harm, 146
 compared with *Palsgraf*, 148
- inadvertent errors, 53
- Indiana Inner Harbor Belt Railway Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 162
 on dangerousness as a test, 174
- information
 and analysis of *Vincent*, 208–11
 as justification for internalization, 191
 as source of responsibility, 189
 distinguishing intent from negligence, 227
- information asymmetries
 and offensive conduct, 233
- Ingalls v. Bills*
 and utmost care, 202
- intentional infliction of emotional distress
 as negligence concept, 229, 233
- intentional torts
 analyzed as other-regarding behavior, 226–34
 and reasonableness defenses, 233–4
 compared with negligence, 229–31
- interpersonal comparisons
 and veil of ignorance, 92, 100
 as coordinating device, 92
 distinguishing welfare comparisons, 99
- is and ought
 from veil of ignorance, 98
- J.I. Case Co. v. Sanderfur*
 and open and obvious dangers, 203
- John T. Arnold Assocs. v. City of Wichita*, 174
- Jones, William K.
 on evidentiary basis for strict liability, 155
 on loss-spreading, 157
- judge
 role in determining duty, 122
 role in jury cases, 119
- jurisprudence
 concepts of law compared, xx–xxiii
- jury
 instructions in proximate cause, 129
 role in duty cases, 119, 122
- justificational analysis
 analytical content, xxiii
 and human behavior, 238
 and product liability, 195–8
 and *Vincent*, 179–93
 as hidden by strict liability, 151
 conceptual understanding, xxi
 defined, xii–xiii, xv
 inadequate justification of *Vincent*, 179–86
- Kaczorowski, Robert J.
 on common carrier duties, 202
- Kant, Immanuel
 and consequentialism, 83–5
 and humans as ends, 85–90
 as extended by Rawls, 92
 interpreted, 74–90
 related to social cohesion, 101
 relation to duty, 107
- Kaplow, Louis
 and welfare maximization, 70

- Keating, Gregory C.
 and justifications, xiv
 enterprise liability, 215
 on duty, 106, 118
 on enterprise liability, 157
 on justification for *Vincent*, 184
 on Kant, 75
 on reasonable and rational, 8
 on reciprocal risks, 154
 reasonable person example, 32
 theory compared with Ripstein's, 158
- Keeton, Robert
 conditional fault, 186
- Klar, Lewis N.
 justification for *Vincent*, 185
- Klueckhorn, Clyde
 on social value formation, 13
- Kraus, Jody S.
 on determinacy, xiii
- Landes, William M.
 on frequency decisions, 168
 on proximate cause, 133
 on transactions costs, 66
- law and economics
 and proximate cause, 133, 139
 and the *Vincent* case, 181
 and value formation, 66
 as behavioral science, 70
 integrating other disciplines, 71
 justification for strict liability, 159
 lack of theory for strict liability, 152
 relationship to corrective justice, 66
 unspecified values, xvi–xvii
- Leff, Arthur, xvi
- lesser-included expected harm
 as justification for *Polemis*, 147
- Levmore, Saul
 on misfeasance/nonfeasance, 105
- liability
 distinguished from responsibility, 134
- Lombardo v. Hoag*
 as enabling tort, 121
- Longmeid v. Holiday*
 as no-duty, not privity case, 197
- Lopez v. Winchell's Donut House*
 and reasonable restraint, 233
- loss spreading
 as inadequate justification for
Vincent, 182
 as rationale for strict liability, 157
- Lubin v. Iowa City*
 as strict or enterprise liability, 214
- MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*,
 and duty to investigate, 165, 198
- Mahone v. Birmingham Electric Co.*, 142
- manufacturing defects
 and physician defects, 213
 compared with medical malpractice, 167
- market failure
 and customer decisions, 216
 as justification for intervention, 206
- McDonald's Hot Coffee Case
 analyzed, 218–22
 as strict liability case, 214
- McDougald v. Perry*
 on duty to inspect, 166
- McLaughlin v. Mine Safety Appliances Co.*
 as a no-breach case, 143
- McLean v. Burbank*
 and utmost care, 202
- medical malpractice
 compared with manufacturing
 defects, 167
- Meier, Stephan
 on causes of other-regarding
 behavior, 10
- Miller v. Civil Constructors, Inc.*, 173
- Mitchell v. United States*, 167
- Moch Co. v. Rensselaer Water Co.*
 as related to duty, 113
- moral agency
 and but-for test, 136
 and intentional torts, 231
 and reasonable person standard, 137
 and responsibility, 136
- Moren v. Samuel M. Langston Co.*
 and duty to investigate, 210
- Natural Justice*, 15
- negligence
 actors who create risk, 114–15
 and activity-level decisions, 162
 and frequency decisions, 172
 and intentional torts, 232
 and reciprocal risks, 153
 as alternative to strict liability, 151
 for violations of standards, 167
 incorporating strict liability, 159
 risk created by others, 116–17
 two kinds of cases, 114–18

- negligence regime
 - as inadequate for activity levels, 152
- norms
 - as reflections of values, 34
- other-regarding behavior
 - and Hand formula, 29–31
 - and intentional torts, 226–34
 - and reasonable person, 10
 - and veil of ignorance, 45
 - as central requirement, 5
 - as justification for *Vincent*, 187
 - by the victim, 109
 - explained, 7–10
 - of customers, 218
 - of customers to customers, 217
 - of suppliers, 216
 - relationship to social cohesion, 16
- ought and is
 - from veil of ignorance, 98
- outputs and inputs
 - summary of, 239
- Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd. v. Morts Dock & Engineering Co.*
 - and foreseeability, 131
- Overseas Tankship (U.K.) Ltd. v. The Miller Steamship Co.*
 - and foreseeability, 131
- Owen, David G.
 - duty to investigate, 165
- Palsgraf v. Long Island Ry. Co.*
 - and duty to world, 115
 - analyzed, 140–1
 - compared with *Polemis*, 148
 - on negligence in the air, 36
- Pareto efficiency, 67
- Parisi, Francesco
 - on frequency decision, 168
- Parrott v. Wells-Fargo*, 137
- Perry, Stephen R.
 - and other-regarding theory, 5
 - relating Rawls to tort theory, 92
- Petition of Kinsman Transit Co.* distinguished
 - from proximate cause, 132
- philosophy
 - role in social cohesion, 14
- Pittsburg Reduction Co., v. Horton*, 144
- Ploof v. Putnam*
 - and doctrine of necessity, 180
- Porat, Ariel
 - and other-regarding theory, 4
- Posecai v. Wal-Mart Stores Inc.*,
 - and duty, 123
- Posner, Richard A.
 - on frequency decisions, 168
 - on proximate cause, 133
 - on transactions costs, 66
- Powers Jr., William
 - on identity of services and products, 200
- preexisting condition
 - and proximate cause, 128
- principles
 - inadequate as sources of wisdom, 239
- private law
 - and distributive justice, 158
 - as institutionalized social
 - coordination, 237
 - characteristics, 241
- privilege
 - invoked in *Vincent*, 180
- privity
 - as proxy for no-duty, 198
 - in development of service liability, 201
- product liability
 - and agency relationships, 206–8
 - and caveat emptor, 203
 - and information asymmetries, 208–11
 - as analog to service liability, 200
 - manufacturing defects, 213
 - summary of argument, 198–200
- Products Liability Restatement*
 - and duty to investigate, 210
 - on frequency decisions, 171
 - on manufacturing defects, 167, 211
- products and services
 - identical as to responsibility, 200
- projects and preferences
 - comparative ranking, 41
 - defined, 7
- property rights
 - and *Vincent*, 182
- proportionality principle
 - as justification for *Vincent*, 188
 - as unexplained justification for *Vincent*, 184
- Prosser, William L.
 - and the citadel, 195
 - on proximate cause, 132
- proximate cause
 - and comparative negligence, 144
 - central question, 135
 - relationship to duty, 136
 - unjustified approaches, 133

- punitive damages
 - and settlement values, 222
- Rabin, Robert L.
 - enabling torts as agency relations, 200
 - on enabling torts, 121
- Randi W. v. Muroc Joint Unified School District*
 - reliance as duty, 121
- rational and reasonable
 - why it is rational to be reasonable, 8
- Rawls, John
 - as extension of Kant, 92
 - distinction between rational and reasonable, 8
 - on the categorical imperative, 77
 - related to social cohesion, 101
 - veil of ignorance applied to torts, 91–9
- reasonableness
 - and intentional torts, 231
- reciprocity
 - and the veil of ignorance, 95
 - as basic issue, 101
 - in norm formation, 35
 - of burdens, 42
- reliance
 - as determinate of duty, 121
- res ipsa loquitur*
 - and manufacturing defects, 211
 - and manufacturer's duties, 203
 - and residual risk, 175
 - as substitute for utmost standard, 203
 - relation to intentional torts, 234
 - showing flexibility of negligence, 167
 - used to test defendant's veracity, 21
- residual risk
 - defined, 159
 - measuring it, 172–7
 - responsibility for, 175–7
- responsibility
 - and circumstances, 140
 - distinguished from liability, 134
- Restatement Second*
 - and theories of harms, 175
 - on activity-level negligence, 163
 - on frequency decisions, 170
- Restatement Third*
 - and liability for residual risk, 175
 - and proximate cause, 127
 - justifications for proximate cause, 131
 - on duty, 114
 - on loss spreading, 157
 - on water main breaks, 174
 - reasonable person standard, 25
 - risk rule, 129
- Resteiner v. Sturm Ruger & Co.*, 173
- Reter v. Talent Irrigation Dist.*, 174
- Richter v. Limex Int'l, Inc.*
 - and duty to inspect, 166
 - and duty to investigate, 210
- Ripstein, Arthur
 - and other-regarding theory, xiv
 - arguing against strict liability, 176
 - corrective justice theory, xiv
 - on justification for *Vincent*, 183
 - on non-reciprocal risks, 154
 - on proximate cause, 131, 133
 - on risk ownership, 106
 - skepticism about veil of ignorance, 93
 - theory compared with Keating's, 158
 - weak support for strict liability, 152
- risk
 - and ambiguity, 112
 - determinate of duty, 120
 - distinction between reciprocal and non-reciprocal, 153
 - measuring residual risk, 172–7
 - residual risk analyzed, 172–7
 - responsibility for residual, 175–7
- Robins Dry Dock and Repair Co. v. Flint*, 197
- Rodgers v. Central Pac. Ry. Co.*, 108
- Rosenberg, David
 - approach to welfare economics, 65
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques
 - version of the categorical imperative, 88
- Rylands v. Fletcher*
 - and reciprocal risks, 155
 - as activity-level decision, 161
 - Holmes's view, 156
- Scanlon, T. M., xiv
- scope of the duty
 - as question for judge, 119
- scope of the risk
 - as determinate of duty, 122
- Seavey, Warren
 - on proximate cause, 128
- Seith v. Commonwealth Electric Co.*, 144, 145
- self-interest
 - as other-regarding, 9
 - distinguished from selfish, 9
- Sen, Amartya
 - capabilities approach, 27

- service liability
 - as analog to product liability, 200
- services and products
 - as identical as to responsibility, 200
- Shapo, Marshall, S.
 - on culture and law, 6
- Shavell, Steven
 - activity-level negligence, 180
 - and welfare maximization, 70
 - on duty to investigate, 165
 - on frequency decisions, 168
 - on loss spreading, 158
- Sibley, W.M.
 - distinction between rational and reasonable, 9
- Simon, Herbert A.
 - on bounded rationality, 138
- Singer, Joseph William
 - on economic analysis, xvi
- Sinram v. Pennsylvania Ry. Co.*, 135, 145
- Smith v. Edwards*
 - as exception to thin-skull rule, 145
- Smith v. Rogers Group, Inc.*
 - heeding presumption, 211
- social cohesion
 - and choice, 109
 - and economic analysis, 64
 - and individual decisions, 61
 - and intentional torts, 229–31
 - and moral agency, 138
 - and proximate cause, 135
 - and ranking of projects and preferences, 42
 - and social morality, 12
 - as a moral concept, 62
 - as goal of law, 14
 - as internal to the law, 17
 - combining deterrence and correction, 17
 - conceptual requirements, 15
 - related to moral theory, 101
 - relationship to other-regarding behavior, 16
- social index
 - and veil of ignorance, 43, 44
 - combining efficiency and fairness, 67
 - development of, 46
 - of relative values, 42
 - related to interpersonal comparisons, 100
- social ranking
 - described, 68
 - see also social index
- special relationship
 - as determining duty, 120
- St. Peter v. Denison*, 161
- Stapleton, Jane
 - on proximate cause, 130
- Stiglitz, Joseph
 - information and product liability, 209
- Stone v. Boston & Albany Ry.*, 144
- Strauss v. Belle Realty Co.*
 - and cutting off liability, 115
 - distinguished from proximate cause, 131
- strict liability
 - and activity level decisions, 19
 - and compliance errors, 55
 - and justificational analysis, 54
 - and product liability, 205
 - and supplier responsibility, 222
 - applied in *Hammontree*, 19
 - as misnomer with product liability, 194
 - awkwardness in negligence regime, 151
 - coherent as applied to all accidents, 150
 - enterprise liability theory, 157
 - in *Vincent*, 179
 - loss-spreading rationale, 157
 - restatement compared with economic approach, 159
 - thin justifications for, 152
- Sugarman, Robert D.
 - economic justification for *Vincent*, 181
 - inadequate justifications for *Vincent*, 180
- Sullivan v. Dunham*, 162
 - as activity-level decision, 162
 - as reasonableness case, 167
- supplier liability
 - and compliance errors, 48
- Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California*
 - and special relationships, 120
- Tenbarge v. Ames Taping Tool Sys. Inc.*
 - heeding presumption, 211
- Texas and Pacific Ry. v. McCleery*, 142
- The Death of Strict Liability*, 150
- Thibault v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*
 - duty for open and obvious dangers, 211
- thin-skull rule
 - and proximate cause, 128
 - justified, 142
- Traynor, Roger
 - on manufacturer responsibility, 207
- Tremain v. Cohoes Co.*, 161
- trespass
 - as poor justification for *Vincent*, 185
- Trimarco v. Klein*
 - and duty to warn, 202
 - and empathy requirement, 40

Index

257

- Uhr v. East Greenbush Central School District*
and duty, 123
unjust enrichment
and the *Vincent* case, 185
utmost standard of care
analyzed, 57
and dimensions of duty, 57
- value formation
described, 33
in comparing projects and preferences, 32
- values
as inputs, not outputs, 33
- Van Skike v. Zussman*, 137
- Vandermark v. Ford Motor Co.*, 195
- Vaughn v. Menlove*, 48
- veil of ignorance
and deontology, 93
and distributive justice, 95
and informational requirements, 98
and “no duty” rules, 111
and social interest, 95
applied to *Hammontree*, 20, 43
as allowing comparisons of well-being, 43
as consequential device, 93
as device people would choose, 96
described, 94–9
developed for distributive justice, 92
- Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co.*
analyzed, 179–93
and McDonald’s hot coffee case, 219
and obligations of suppliers, 221
as a fault case, 186–92
as reciprocal risk, 153
- Wagner v. Int’l Ry. Co.*, 145
- Wagon Mound*
and foreseeability, 131
- Weinrib, Ernest
and duty, xiii
and other-regarding theory, 4
case against strict liability, 152, 176
interpreting Kant, 74–90
on *Bolton v. Stone*, 165
on misfeasance/nonfeasance, 114
- Weirum v. RKO General Inc.*, 145
- welfare maximization
and social cohesion, 65
- Welfare versus Fairness*, 15
- Wells, Michael, L.
on proximate cause, 132
- Williams v. Bright*
avoidable consequences as proximate cause, 145
- Williams, Glanville
justification for *Vincent*, 181
- Winterbottom v. Wright*
standard understanding disputed, 196
- Wishnatsky v. Dailey*
and reasonable contact, 232
- Wooderson v. Ortho Pharm. Corp.*
duty to inspect, 166
- Wright, Richard W.
and other-regarding behavior, 26
on ends and means, 86
on Hand formula, 25
on reasonableness standard, 26
proximate cause as
responsibility, 134
- Zaza v. Marquess & Nell, Inc.*
on proximate cause, 132
- Zipurksy, Benjamin C.
and compliance errors, 53
and inadvertent error, 53
and justifications, xiii
and other-regarding theory, 5
approaches to reasonable person, 24
civil competency approach to
reasonable person, 28
on duty, xv, 106, 116