

A New Introduction to Legal Method

Paul Cliteur & Afshin Ellian

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Is legal science a real science?	3
<i>The first characteristic of science: consensus on a few basic facts</i>	5
<i>The second characteristic of science: the experiment</i>	9
<i>The third characteristic of science: accumulation of knowledge</i>	12
<i>The fourth characteristic of science: making predictions</i>	15
<i>The rule-skepticism of the American realists</i>	18
<i>From American realism to Critical Legal Studies and law and economics</i>	21
<i>Is the study of the law scholarship or science?</i>	25
<i>“Classical Legal Doctrine” versus “Critical Legal Studies”</i>	28
<i>The (un)popularity of CLD</i>	30
<i>Empirical Legal Studies</i>	38
<i>Empirical Legal Studies and international law</i>	38
<i>Journal of Empirical Legal Studies</i>	39
<i>Some notes on religion</i>	39
<i>Empirical Legal Studies and penal law</i>	41
<i>Elaine Mak’s inaugural address</i>	44
<i>The discussion on “cimmigration”</i>	46
<i>The meaning of Empirical Legal Studies</i>	49
2 American realism	50
<i>Introduction</i>	50
<i>A school? A movement? A mindset?</i>	52
<i>What they oppose: Langdell’s method</i>	54
<i>Studying the law in real life</i>	56
<i>Realism’s first founding father: Holmes</i>	57

Holmes the aphorist 59

Holmes as the founding father of the prediction theory of law 62

The judge at center stage. Realism's second founding father: Gray 64

Early rule-skepticism. Frank and others 67

Six reasons for rule-skepticism 69

The fully formed rule-skepticism of Richard Taylor 71

How does a draftee justify his refusal to serve in the military? 73

Taylor's vision applied to a legal example 75

The philosophical background of rule-skepticism 76

Differences between the realists 78

Fact-skepticism 80

Law as decision. Realism as decisionism 82

Research into the true determinants of judicial decisions 85

Instrumentalism 87

Legal education 88

Where the realists differed: Frank against predictivism; law as "art," not as science 91

Criticism of specifically American institutions: the Supreme Court 93

An evaluation of the realists 97

 (a) *Were the realists precise enough?* 97

 (b) *How original were the realists?* 100

 (c) *Were the realists consistent?* 101

 (d) *Were the realist ideas about legal education "realistic"?* 103

 (e) *Were the realists "fair" in their criticism?* 104

 (f) *Can the law be studied as a de facto pattern of behavior?* 106

3 Rationalism, empiricism, and logical positivism: A methodological journey through a permanent reversal of doubt and certainty

109

Rationalism and empiricism 110

The Kantian synthesis and logical positivism 118

Critical rationalism: The Open Universe 125

4 Popper's critique of essentialism and the scientific outlook

131

An introduction 131

Popper's critique of essentialism 134

<i>The critique of the critique of essentialism</i>	143
<i>The incoherence of incoherence (Tahafut al-Tahafut)</i>	154
<i>In conclusion</i>	161

5 Three types of legal interpretation 165

<i>Introduction</i>	165
<i>Dutch authors about legal interpretation</i>	167
<i>Part I: General introduction to the separation of powers</i>	168
1648: <i>the nation-state</i>	168
1748: <i>constitutionalism ("Rechtsstaat")</i>	170
1848: <i>democracy</i>	171
1948: <i>human rights</i>	171
<i>The Americans and judicial review</i>	172
<i>What is a good balance of powers?</i>	174
<i>Part II: G.J. Wiarda's presentation of the prevailing paradigm in legal interpretation theory</i>	176
<i>Away from Montesquieu</i>	178
<i>Montesquieu's three forms of government</i>	179
<i>Montesquieu's monarchy</i>	180
<i>Heteronomy and autonomy of the judicial verdict</i>	182
<i>Assessment of Wiarda's adoption of the monarchy</i>	182
<i>What Montesquieu made public and what he did not</i>	185
<i>Robespierre and Portalis</i>	188
<i>Letter and spirit</i>	191
<i>Autonomy remains the main feature of Wiarda's argument</i>	193
<i>European and international law</i>	196
<i>Interpretation methods</i>	198
<i>Wiarda's cautious reservations about the liberalization process</i>	201
<i>The unpredictability of the judicial verdict</i>	203
<i>Not a real legislator</i>	203
<i>The constitutional problem</i>	204
<i>Hume's warning that we cannot deduce norms from facts</i>	210
<i>A counterweight to Wiarda's views on legal interpretation</i>	212
<i>In conclusion</i>	214