

#### PROPERTY LAW AND SOCIAL MORALITY

Property Law and Social Morality develops a theory of property that highlights the social construction of obligations that individuals owe each other. By viewing property law through the lens of obligations rather than through the lens of rights, the author affirms the existence of important property rights (when no obligation to another exists) and defines the scope of those rights (when an obligation to another does exist). By describing the scope of the decisions that individuals are permitted to make and the requirements of other-regarding decisions, the author develops a single theory to explain the dynamics of private and common property, including exclusion, nuisance, shared decision making, and decision making over time. By developing a theory of social recognition, the author adds to our understanding of property evolution and the principle of equal freedom that helps us chart the scope of property rights and the limits on government interference with those rights.

Professor Peter M. Gerhart has been a dean; a legal scholar in antitrust, regulated industries, international trade, international transactions, international intellectual property law, torts, and property; and a scholar of globalization. A graduate of Columbia Law School, he has taught at the law schools of The Ohio State University and Case Western Reserve University, and, as a visiting professor, at the law schools of Georgetown and the University of Texas, the Central European University in Budapest, and the Weatherhead School of Business. He is the author of *Tort Law and Social Morality* (Cambridge University Press, 2010) and has published articles in a wide variety of fields.





# Property Law and Social Morality

PETER M. GERHART

Case Western Reserve University School of Law





# **CAMBRIDGE**UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107006454

© Peter M. Gerhart 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Gerhart, Peter M.

Property law and social morality / Peter M. Gerhart, Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-00645-4 (hardback)

K721.5.G47 2014

346.04-dc23 2013027357

ISBN 978-1-107-00645-4 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



Dr. Louise F. Westfall: great human being, inspiring leader, believer





### Contents

Pre	race	page 1X
Ack	knowledgments	xiii
PAI	RT I A UNIFIED THEORY	1
1	Property's Values	3
2	An Overview of the Theory	46
3	Owner as Decision Maker	62
4	Ownership and Social Recognition	73
5	Other-Regarding Decision Making	109
6	Assigning Burdens and Benefits	129
PAI	RT II APPLICATIONS	159
7	Exclusion	161
8	Nuisance: Spatial Coordination	185
9	Concurrent Decision Makers	212
10	Temporal Coordination	227
PAI	RT III LEGISLATIVE REGULATION AND SOCIAL MORALITY	247
11	A Theory of Legislative Regulation	249
12	The Takings Power	274
13	Legislative Regulation and Assigning Burdens	290
14	The Promise of Unity	311
References		317
Index		329

vii





#### Preface

Property makes people's blood boil, although in different ways for people with property and people without it. Property law makes people's eyes glaze over, for property is encrusted with ancient formalities and arcane language. Property is at once a red-hot topic and a sleeper, a subject central to our political and social lives and Exhibit I in the pantheon of legal formalism.

When asked several years ago to teach the first-year Property Law course, I readily agreed. I wanted to see whether the ideas I had developed over a dozen years of teaching Tort Law would help remove property's political patina and the shroud of legal formalism. In the torts course, I had developed a way of thinking about one individual's responsibility for the well-being of others – a theory of private law that might be of value in understanding property law. Indeed, the more I read and taught, the more I realized that the way to defang and demystify property law was to reorient the field to understand it as one about how individuals ought to treat one another if they are to form an authentic community. Just as tort law is often (but not exclusively) about the rules of the road (and therefore about the rules governing open access property), property law concerns the rules governing the allocation and governance of resources in other ownership forms. I also realized that, unlike in tort law, I had to develop a theory of how individuals in a community, functioning as a group of individuals through their state, ought to think about their individual well-being in light of their collective well-being. Although tort law, drawn as it is from interpersonal relationships, rarely raises issues of collective well-being and collective will, property law must confront the relationship between the individual and the society in which individuals interact.

This book results from that exploration. Starting from the well-grounded notion that property law is about the relationship between individuals regarding things, whether owned privately or in common, I offer this account of how we might think about and justify what the law expects of individuals and a

ix



x Preface

community of individuals in property relationships. My account is based on a theory of social morality, by which I mean the way individuals interact when they would act morally, private owner to nonowner, private owner to private owner, among common owners, and between the community (represented by its state) and a private owner. It is a theory of ownership because it is a theory about which decisions of owners are worthy of respect by the community and which decisions by the community are worthy of respect by individuals. It is a theory of responsibility with respect to resources because it reveals how individuals ought to think about each other's well-being when they, and their community, have conflicts over resources.

The book has three parts. Part I presents a theory of private law as it pertains to property – a theory about what each individual can expect from other individuals when disputes arise over resources. I lay out four propositions that, taken together, provide a framework for addressing conflicts over property in private law and for determining when individuals are acting morally as they work out resource conflicts. In Part II, I apply that framework to suggest how we might think differently about the central areas of the private law of property: exclusion, nuisance, concurrent decision making, and temporal coordination.

The theory developed in Parts I and II is a theory of the obligations of one individual to other individuals. It is a theory of responsibility because it identifies the obligations that are categorical as between free and equal individuals. It is also a consequential theory because it acknowledges that individuals must take into account some (but not all) consequences when deciding how to fulfill their responsibilities. This integration of the deontic and the consequential relies on a distinction between the methodology an individual who would act morally would use to think about his or her relationships with other individuals (the deontic) and the kinds of considerations that are relevant when the individual employs that method (the consequential). The categorical obligation is the obligation to act as one would if one had used a method of making decisions that is agnostic as to the decision maker's ends. The method itself determines which consequences the ideal decision maker may not take into account and the weight to be given the factors the ideal decision maker must take into account. I also show how individuals ought to reconcile their responsibilities to others with the consequences of their decisions when the two appear to conflict.

Part III focuses on the relationship between the individual and the community of individuals as represented by their state. Property is a part of a complex and evolving social and political system that shapes the rights and limitations of ownership and the relationship between ownership and the well-being of



Preface xi

the community. Whereas Parts I and II model the proper social relationship between individuals, Part III models the proper social relationship between the individual and the community of individuals acting through their state. Like its earlier counterparts, Part III is also a theory of bilateral relationships, for it models the relationship between the individual and the community as one of bilateral responsibility. It too is a theory of moral decision making, for it too describes the kind of considerations that govern decision making about resources when the individual and the community interact, including both limitations on owners (imposed by the state) and limitations on the state (imposed by the concept of property). Just as Parts I and II chart the content and limits of property rights in private law, Part III charts the content and limits of property rights when subjected to the will of the community through the state's legislative power.





## Acknowledgments

The book has benefited from comments by colleagues who have taken the time to set me straight or encourage me, or both, including colleagues at Case Western Reserve – Jonathan Adler, Juliet Kostritsky, and Catherine LaCroix (who tutored me on land use planning) – and by colleagues elsewhere – Jim Krier (whose careful reading helped me avoid mistakes), Paul Malloy, Douglas North (for portions of the manuscript), and Joseph Singer. None of them, of course, is responsible for what I have written, nor do they necessarily share my views. Teaching is about learning, and I have learned from my students at Case Western Reserve and as a visiting professor at the University of Texas. Students in my seminar on Theories of Property Law at Case Western Reserve read drafts of various chapters and did their own research in the shadow of these ideas, helping sharpen many and modify some. The book has also benefited from the efforts of splendid research assistants who have worked with me over the past four years; Andrea Lee worked with me on a sustained and supportive basis, and Benjamin Galea, Zachary Smigiel, Andrew Webman, Seth Corthell, and Alexander Ahern have done smaller, but significant, stints along the way. Lingyu Jia volunteered her time for several projects that found their way into these pages, and, at the University of Texas, Elizabeth Nguyen took the manuscript from almost done to completion. Bobby Cheren, who was instrumental in helping me develop a casebook to reflect the ideas here, shaped many of the ideas in this book through our many fruitful discussions and our collaboration on the casebook.

The manuscript was overseen in various drafts by Catherine Adkins and Iwona Hrelja at Case Western Reserve and by Angel Leffingwell and Penny Tillman at the University of Texas. To all of these individuals, I express my deep gratitude.

xiii