
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH NETWORK

LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP NETWORK: LEGAL STUDIES RESEARCH PAPER SERIES
UC DAVIS SCHOOL OF LAW
Vol. 8, No. 4: October 17, 2006

Editors: KEVIN R. JOHNSON
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of
Law, and Mabie/Apallas Professor of Public
Interest Law and Chicana/o Studies, University of
California, Davis
KRJOHNSON@UCDAVIS.EDU

BROWSE all abstracts in this subject:
<http://www.ssrn.com/link/uc-davis-legal-studies.html>

SEARCH entire eLibrary at: <http://ssrn.com/search>

If this document is misaligned, please set type face to a non-
proportional font such as Courier 10.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

"Taking Free Exercise Rights Seriously"

ALAN E. BROWNSTEIN

University of California at Davis Law School

"IP3"

MADHAVI SUNDER

University of California, Davis - School of Law

"Election Commissions and Electoral Reform: An Overview"

CHRISTOPHER S. ELMENDORF

University of California, Davis - School of Law

"Using Science in a Political World: The Importance of
Transparency in Natural Resource Regulation"

HOLLY DOREMUS

University of California, Davis - School of Law

"Taking Free Exercise Rights Seriously"

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 81

Case Western Reserve Law Review, Vol. 47, No. 1, Fall
2006

Contact: ALAN E. BROWNSTEIN

University of California at Davis Law School

Email: aebrownstein@ucdavis.edu

Auth-Page: <http://ssrn.com/author=72089>

Full Text: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=931687>

ABSTRACT: This article attempts to begin a conversation about taking free exercise rights seriously. If we read current case law and commentary, the constitutional project of protecting religious liberty requires an unpalatable, all or nothing, choice: Courts can strictly scrutinize everything a state does that substantially burdens religious exercise or they can deferentially uphold all such state action - as long as it does not discriminate against religion or a particular faith. The only alternative is the worst scenario of all - a regime where judges engage in unprincipled, unpredictable, subjective, and completely ad hoc balancing of free exercise rights against competing state interests.

This article suggests that there is a fourth choice. Courts can develop a nuanced, complex free exercise jurisprudence as they have done in adjudicating free speech and equal protection cases. Even an initial sketch of this alternative must confront formidable problems, however. First, protecting religious exercise often provides religious individuals and institutions benefits of secular value as well as the freedom to practice their faith. A persuasive framework for adjudicating free exercise cases must explain or mitigate those surplus secular advantages. Second, a principled doctrine framework requires drawing distinctions that justify the application of different standards of review in different circumstances. One possible free exercise model would provide greater protection to religious exercise involving the operation of religious institutions - when instrumental as opposed to dignitary values are furthered.

Another would consider how the location where religion is practiced should influence the level of protection it receives.

Third, the balancing process itself, under any standard of review, must be constrained and guided. Free exercise doctrine can not develop in a constitutional vacuum if we are even to begin to address this problem. Useful analogies should be drawn between the

costs society accepts as the price it must pay to protect other fundamental rights, and the costs and harms that may result from protecting the exercise of religion. Similarly, claims for religious exemption need not be drawn on a blank slate. The consequences of past and continuing legislative accommodations can inform courts and help to provide an objective basis for evaluating state interests alleged to justify restrictions on religious exercise.

"IP3"

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 82
Stanford Law Review, Vol. 59, 2006

Contact: MADHAVI SUNDER
University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: msunder@ucdavis.edu
Auth-Page: <http://ssrn.com/author=280597>
Full Text: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=897753>

ABSTRACT: A quarter century ago, Margaret Jane Radin interrupted the hegemonic law and economic discourse on property with a theory of personhood. And the New Jersey Supreme Court declared in the historic case of State v. Shack that property rights serve human values. From these our modern social relations theory of property was born. Now, the pundits declare that intellectual property has come of age. But is intellectual property philosophically and theoretically mature enough to face the world? Unlike its cousins property law and the First Amendment, which bear the weight of values such as autonomy, culture, equality, and democracy, in the United States intellectual property is understood almost exclusively as about incentives. To put it bluntly, there are no giant-sized intellectual property values. But there should be.

Intellectual property has grown, perhaps exponentially, but its march into all corners of our lives and to the most destitute corners of the world has paradoxically exposed the fragility of its economic foundations while amplifying its social and cultural effects. Indeed, with full compliance to the TRIPS Agreement now required in all but the world's very least developed countries, bringing with it patents in everything from seeds to drugs, intellectual property law becomes literally an issue of life or death. Despite these real world changes, intellectual property scholars increasingly explain their field through the lens of economics alone, evidence of Amartya Sen's observation that theories have lives of their own, quite defiantly of the phenomenal world that can be actually observed.

The theory is behind the practice. On the ground, underground, and in the ether, intellectual property is spurring what the New York Times calls the first new social movement of the century. I show that in case after case, from MGM v. Grokster, to new licenses from the Creative Commons for developing nations and cultural heritage, to the rise of Internet auteurs of fan fiction, mash-ups, and machinima, to efforts to deliver medicines to the world's poor, to demands for Geographical Indications for sarees and other crafts of the developing world, and to the nascent global movement for Access to Knowledge, traditional economic analysis fails to capture fully the struggles at the heart of local/global intellectual property law conflicts. This Article builds from these examples to lay a foundation for a cultural analysis of intellectual property. I offer IP3 as a metonym. The twentieth century closed with the rise of identity politics, the Internet Protocol, and intellectual property rights. I suggest that the convergence of these IPs begins to explain the growth of intellectual property rights where traditional justifications for intellectual property do not. IP3 reveals intellectual property's social effects and this law as a tool for crafting cultural relations. Call it the ripping, mixing, and burning of law.

"Election Commissions and Electoral Reform: An Overview"

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 86

Election Law Journal, Vol. 5, 2006

Contact: CHRISTOPHER S. ELMENDORF

University of California, Davis - School of Law

Email: cselmendorf@ucdavis.edu

Auth-Page: <http://ssrn.com/author=345940>

Abstract: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=931462>

ABSTRACT: This article offers an introductory look at the roles of independent commissions in electoral reform. Part I surveys the range of de jure powers and responsibilities that different countries have assigned to independent electoral commissions, and then explores the functional mechanisms by which these commissions can wield influence in practice. The main lesson is that even agencies whose formal authority over the ground rules of political competition is quite limited (e.g., monitoring and advice-giving bodies) may significantly affect the development of election law, thanks to the mediating forces of public opinion and constitutional judicial review. Part II maps out four subjects for future research: first, the workings of the mechanisms of influence posited in Part I; second, the consequences of combining election administration and law reform responsibilities in the same body, as opposed to segregating these functions in different bodies; third,

the relationship between the independent body's structure and powers and its selection of law reforms; and, fourth, the implications of different theories of political process failure for the structure and de jure authority of electoral commissions.

"Using Science in a Political World: The Importance of Transparency in Natural Resource Regulation"

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 87

RESCUING SCIENCE FROM POLITICS, Wendy Wagner, Rena Steinzor, eds., Cambridge University Press, July 2006

Contact: HOLLY DOREMUS

University of California, Davis - School of Law

Email: hddoremus@ucdavis.edu

Auth-Page: <http://ssrn.com/author=37460>

Abstract: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=906921>

ABSTRACT: The process of using scientific information to make natural resource policy decisions is a complex one necessarily involving both political and scientific judgments. The fundamental challenge is to ensure that political judgments match societal goals and remain accountable to the public, while scientific judgments match our best understanding of the natural world and remain accountable to the relevant scientific community.

Transparency is an important tool for ensuring both types of accountability. Transparency about who makes regulatory decisions, about the scientific basis for those decisions, and especially about the value choices made in the translation step from science to policy are essential to the effective use of scientific information in the political world of policymaking.

Yet transparency is notably lacking in natural resource regulatory decisions that bridge the worlds of science and policy. In particular, the value choices underlying those decisions are often hidden. In addition, it is often very difficult for outsiders to discover what role agency scientific advice ultimately played in a decision, or even what the substance of that advice was. I argue that the courts can and should address both problems, the first by applying well established principles of administrative law to demand that regulatory agencies reveal and explain their value choices, and the second by limiting the use of the deliberative process privilege to prevent disclosure of scientific reports and recommendations.

S O L I C I T A T I O N O F A B S T R A C T S

The University of California, Davis School of Law Legal Studies journal contains abstracts and papers from this institution focused on this area of scholarly research. To access all the papers in this series, please use the following URL:

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/UC-Davis-Legal-Studies.html>

To submit your research to SSRN, log in to the SSRN User Headquarters, <http://hq.ssrn.com>, and click on the My Papers link on the left menu, and then click on Start New Submission at the top of the page.

D I S T R I B U T I O N S E R V I C E S

If your Institution is interested in learning more about increasing readership for its research by becoming a Partner in Publishing or starting a Research Paper Series, please email: Management@SSRN.com.

D I S T R I B U T E D B Y

LSN, a division of Social Science Electronic Publishing, Inc. (SSEP) and Social Science Research Network (SSRN)

S U B S C R I P T I O N M A N A G E M E N T

You can change your journal subscriptions by going to the SSRN User Headquarters: <http://hq.ssrn.com>. Please enter the email address where you received this email in the "Your Email Address" field and click "Submit". Click on "Email me this information" on the next screen, and your User ID and Password will be emailed to you. Once you have successfully logged in, you will be able to change your journal subscriptions. If you have questions or problems with this process, please email UserSupport@SSRN.com or call 877-SSRNHelp (toll free 877.777.6435). Outside of the United States, call 00+1+585+4428170.

S I T E L I C E N S E M E M B E R S H I P

Many university departments and other institutions have purchased site licenses covering all of the journals in a particular network. If you want to subscribe to any of the SSRN journals, you may be

able to do so without charge by first checking to see if your institution currently has a site license.

To do this please click on any of the following URLs.
Instructions for joining the site are included on these pages.

Accounting Research Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/arn/arn_site-licenses.html

Economics Research Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/ern/ern_site-licenses.html

Entrepreneurship Research & Policy Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/erp/erp_site-licenses.html

Financial Economics Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/fen/fen_site-licenses.html

Legal Scholarship Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/lsn/lsn_site-licenses.html

Management Research Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/mrn/mrn_site-licenses.html

Social Insurance Research Network

http://www.ssrn.com/update/sirn/sirn_site-licenses.html

If your institution or department is not listed as a site, we would be happy to work with you to set one up. Please email Site@SSRN.com for more information.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP (for those not covered by a site license)

Join a site license, request a trial subscription, or purchase a subscription within the SSRN User Headquarters:

<http://www.ssrn.com/subscribe>

FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

SSRN understands there is financial hardship in certain countries (for example the former Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries). If you are undergoing financial hardship and believe you cannot pay for a journal, please email a detailed explanation to Subscribe@SSRN.com

To ensure delivery of this journal, please add LSN@publish.ssrn.com (Legal Scholarship Network) to your email contact list.

REDISTRIBUTION

Individual and professional subscriptions to the journal are for single users. It is a violation of copyright to redistribute this document electronically or otherwise without the explicit permission of Social Science Electronic Publishing, Inc. Site licenses for organizations are available by emailing Site@SSRN.com

Copyright 2006
SSEP, Inc., all rights reserved.