<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Economics Imperialism in Law and Economics

Malecka, Magdalena

Springer
2019

Malecka , M 2019 , Economics Imperialism in Law and Economics . in A Marciano & G B Ramello (eds) , Encyclopedia of Law and Economics . Springer , New York . https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7883-6_741-1

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/311363>

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7883-6_741-1

draft

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Economic Imperialism in Law and Economics

Magdalena Małecka
TINT – Centre for Philosophy of Social Science,
University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Definition

Economics imperialism is a type of an interdisciplinary relation between the scientific discipline of economics and other disciplines of the social sciences. The disciplines that are often claimed to be “imperialized” by economics are sociology (see Granovetter and Swedberg 2001; Swedberg 1990), political science (see Hodgson 1994; Sigelman and Goldfarb 2012; Kuorikoski and Lehtinen 2010), anthropology (see Marchionatti and Cedrini 2016), geography (see Mäki and Marchionni 2010), and law (see Medema 2018; Davies 2010; Fink 2003). Hence, the law and economics movement is seen by some as one of the manifestations of the imperialism of economics in the social sciences (in this case – in legal scholarship). Below, I review the general debate on economics imperialism, and then I discuss the attempts to analyze law and economics as a case of economics imperialism.

Introduction

Recently, in the philosophy of science literature there is a discussion on scientific imperialism, of which economics imperialism is just an instance. This debate has revolved around the question of the permissibility of the application of scientific theories and methods outside the discipline in which they were initially introduced. Philosophers of science have attempted to clarify what it means for a theory or a discipline to be applied outside its own field or domain, and whether such an application can be understood as imperialistic (Dupré 1994, 2001; Mäki 2013; Clarke and Walsh 2009; Kidd 2013; Clarke and Walsh 2013; contributions to the volume edited by Mäki et al. 2017). It is debated whether scientific imperialism is a neutral or normatively loaded term, how to establish criteria for assessment of imperialistic practices in science, how to categorize different instances of scientific imperialism, as well as whether the political metaphor of imperialism is useful at all in order to account for relationships between scientific disciplines. Mäki et al. (2017) argue that scientific imperialism challenges two central tenets of current scientific practice, as it calls into question two widely spread ideas: (1) that the broader the scope of a scientific theory, the better; (2) that interdisciplinary exchanges bring indisputable benefits (p. 1).

The term “economics imperialism” has been used in the pejorative sense by the critics of the idea of applying economics outside its domain

(Fine and Milonakis 2009; Davis 2015; Hodgson 1994; Nik-Khah and Van Horn 2012) and in the approbatory sense by some economists (most notably by Becker 1971; Hirshleifer 1985; Stigler 1984; Lazear 2000; Radnitzky and Bernholz 1987; Tullock 1972) who have advocated the idea of expanding economic theories and methods to the topics studied by the less advanced, in their opinion, social sciences. “Economics imperialists” have argued that such an expansion is justified by economics’ “growing abstractness” and “generality” that economics achieves thanks to “the machine of maximizing behavior” (Stigler 1984); by the universal applicability of economics’ analytical categories (Hirshleifer 1985); and by economics’ intellectual rigor (Lazear 2000; Posner 1989). Moreover, Mäki (2009) emphasizes that the expansion of economics has been often justified in terms of the ideal of unification – economics is supposed to provide, in the opinion of “imperialists,” a unifying theory for the social sciences. Fine and Milonakis (2009) claim that the theoretical development in economics that made the expansion of economics possible was the marginalist revolution and its basic concepts of equilibrium (see: ► “Equilibrium Theory”), rationality (see: ► “Rationality”), scarcity – “universal in content and application” (p. 8).

Criticism of Economics Imperialism

However, critics of economics imperialism, apart from questioning the alleged advancement of economics as a social science, often point out the importance of non-epistemic arguments and non-academic standing of economics for the successes of its imperialistic scientific practices. For instance, Nik-Khah and Van Horn (2012) claim that economics imperialists of the Chicago School wanted in the first place to influence policy approach by proposing their view on what constitutes the economic analysis of state policy. “Stigler’s program to study ‘governmental control’ constituted a new and distinct approach, rather than mere application of a core Chicago approach to a new domain” (p. 217) (see: ► “Stigler”). Amadae (2018) stresses the

importance of politically motivated expansion of the rational choice theory – its attractiveness for nuclear deterrence made it prestigious in non-academic contexts and in this way has strengthened its standing within academia as well. In this context the affinities of the Chicago School analysis with neoliberalism are often emphasized. Nik-Khah and Van Horn (2012) claim that economics imperialism cannot be really understood if one does not take into account the Chicago School economists’ involvement into the revival of the liberal project, known as neoliberalism – redefinition of the social and the political sphere through the concepts of neoclassical economics – and its impact on the real-world policy design. Therefore, partly in response to this “performative” aims of the Chicago School (Davis 2015), or “pedagogical” effects of the rational choice theory (Amadae 2018), some critics of economics imperialism have argued that the conceptualization of social relationships through the categories of neoclassical economics, or of rational choice, is inherently inadequate (Fine and Milonakis 2009) and can lead to ethically objectionable large-scale sociocultural consequences (Marino 2018) by influencing agents’ self-understanding (Clarke and Walsh 2009).

Is All Economics Imperialistic?

It should be noticed, however, that upon inspection we find out that economics imperialism, as each instance of scientific imperialism, is in fact a relationship between smaller epistemic units than scientific disciplines (Davis 2015; Małecka and Lepenies 2018; Chassonnery-Zaïgouche 2018). The analysis of cases of economics imperialism makes it clear that it is never the case that the *whole* discipline of economics is “imperializing,” e.g., the *whole* sociology. Thus, as Davis (2012) argues, “economics is not all economics” (p. 210). It is usually a particular research program that develops within the discipline of economics and which is being transferred outside, as well as within, economics’ institutional borders.

In contemporary discussions, it is often claimed that only neoclassical economics, and more specifically the Chicago School and its

price theory, are extended to other domains and scientific fields (Davis 2015; Nik-Khah and Van Horn 2012). However, Amadae (2018) argues that it is in fact not the neoclassical economics with its formalization of diminishing marginal utility, what constitutes economics imperialism, but rather the game theory with its view on agency as strategic competition between actors who satisfy their preferences. Guilhot and Marciano (2018) complicate the picture by showing that what is now called the economics imperialism in political science was the application of the rational choice theory to the questions of the political decision-making: it was possible rather due to the rising importance of the decision theory across the social and behavioral sciences after the Second World War. Furthermore, few researchers emphasize that some of the economic approaches, or research programs that we consider imperialistic today, were in fact quite marginal within economics, back in the days. Becker's (see ► "Becker") application of rational choice and price theory to the analysis of social phenomena is one of the examples (Chassonnery-Zaïgouche 2018; Vromen 2009). Chassonnery-Zaïgouche (2018) analyzes economic studies of discrimination and claims that Becker influenced, imperialized, with his work mainly the discipline of economics and has had, in fact, marginal impact on other social sciences studying discrimination.

Despite the seemingly intuitive appeal of the term "economics imperialism," it is not clear what does it mean that one research program is imperializing another, or other. Economics imperialism has been defined, for instance, as "colonisation of the subject matter of other social sciences by economics" (Fine and Milonakis 2009), as "a form of economics expansionism where the new types of explanandum phenomena are located in territories that are occupied by disciplines other than economics" (Mäki 2009), or as "the attempt to extend the core ideas of neoclassical economics to cover social science as a whole" (Hodgson 1994). Most of the definitions account for the metaphorical use of the notion of imperialism as we know it in political context. There is a discussion, however, to what extent the metaphor of

imperialism should be taken seriously when talking about scientific practices. The notion of imperialism is normatively loaded and most scholars believe that one cannot ignore this normative dimension in the case of economics imperialism (Mäki 2013, who defines scientific, and economics, imperialism neutrally, is an exception here). Małecka and Lepenies (2018) provide the definition of scientific imperialism, that applies to economics imperialism, in which they account for the widely shared believe that there is something normatively problematic about economics imperialism. They stress the importance of epistemic and non-epistemic factors for being able to define and identify economics imperialism. Scientific imperialism is an activity that is related both to a certain view on the progressive character of a novel application of an existing research approach (the epistemic aspect) and to a power to favor this approach at the expense of other approaches in terms of academic and nonacademic prestige, or/and resources (the institutional aspect).

Law and Economics as an Instance of Economics Imperialism

Law and economics is often seen as a result of the expansion of the Chicago School approach to law (Mercuro and Medema 2006; Medema 2015, 2018). Sometimes it is understood, more broadly, as an application of orthodox, or neoclassical economics (Jackson 1984; Davies 2010), or of game theory (Pearson 1997) to law (see ► "Game Theory Applications to Law"). Mercuro and Medema (2006) even argue that law and economics "has been the most successful of economists' imperialistic forays into other disciplines" (p. 100).

The application of the price theory to the analysis of law is grounded on the premise that individuals are rational maximizers of their utility, that they respond to price incentives also in non-economic settings and that law can be treated as an incentive. Medema (2015) stresses the importance of Gary Becker's (see ► "Becker") works that advanced the analysis of all social phenomena with the tools of price theory (and econometrics) for the development of economic analysis of law.

Medema (2015) differentiates this “new” law and economics, inspired by the work of Becker, as well as of Richard Posner (see ► “Posner”), from the “old” one, initiated by Aaron Director (see ► “Director”), whose aim was to simply analyze the impact of legal rules on economic performance. According to Medema only the “new” law and economics has features of scientific (economics) imperialism (compare also Epstein 1997 on periodization of law and economics and Harnay and Marciano (2009) on the difference between law and economics and economic analysis on law).

Posner (1989) justifies the application of neo-classical economics to law by the rigor that this type of economic analysis allegedly offers, as well as by the possibility of funding the truly “scientific” analysis of law in this way. Cooter (1981) points out that the reason for the economics imperialism in law is the “discovery” by economists a niche in legal scholarship – a lack of quantitative reasoning. Cooter (1995) also emphasizes the importance of an attempt for unification for applying economics to law.

The historical case study made by Medema (2018) on the ad hoc Joint Committee of the American Economic Association and the Association of American Law Schools established in 1966 to explore the prospects for interactions between lawyers and economists challenges the commonly spread narrative about neoclassical economists conquering a new field. The study demonstrates that lawyers played a crucial role at the early stage of bringing economics to their studies and in replacing “the traditional methods of legal analysis” (Medema 2018, p. 110). However, later on the application of neoclassical economics to law had been opposed by some lawyers as being too abstract an analysis, untested, irrelevant to the courtroom (Cooter 1981). Law and economics as a scientific project of explaining legal phenomena has been also scrutinized and criticized. For instance, Jackson (1984) criticized law and economics’ scientism and its technocratic attitude that made it so dominant in the legal scholarship. For other critics law and economics is mainly a manifestation of “the neo-liberal project of applying neo-classical economics to state

sovereignty” (Davies 2010, p. 64) that has been advanced by non-epistemic arguments and normative views on policy as complying with the goals of economic efficiency (Davies 2010; Fink 2003).

Cross-References

- [Becker](#) 296
- [Equilibrium Theory](#) 297
- [Posner, Richard](#) 298
- [Rationality](#) 299

References

- Amadae SM (2018) Economics imperialism reconsidered. In: Scientific imperialism: exploring the boundaries of interdisciplinarity. p 4 301
- Becker GS (1971) Economic theory. Alfred A. Knopf, New York 302
- Chassonnery-Zaïgouche C (2018) Crossing boundaries, displacing previous knowledge and claiming superiority. In: Scientific imperialism: exploring the boundaries of interdisciplinarity. p 31 303
- Clarke S, Walsh A (2009) Scientific imperialism and the proper relations between the sciences. *Int Stud Philos Sci* 23(2):195–207 304
- Clarke S, Walsh A (2013) Imperialism, progress, developmental teleology, and interdisciplinary unification. *Inter Stud Philos Sci* 27(3):341–351 305
- Cooter RD (1981) Law and the imperialism of economics: an introduction to the economic analysis of law and a review of the major books. *UCLA Law Rev* 29:1260 306
- Cooter R (1995) Law and unified social theory. *J Law Soc* 22(1):50–67 307
- Davies W (2010) Economics and the ‘nonsense’ of law: the case of the Chicago antitrust revolution. *Econ Soc* 39(1):64–83 308
- Davis JB (2012) Mäki on economics imperialism. In: Economics for real: Uskali Mäki and the place of truth in economics. pp 203–219 309
- Davis JB (2015) Economics imperialism versus multidisciplinarity 310
- Dupré J (1994) Against scientific imperialism. In PSA: proceedings of the Biennial meeting of the philosophy of science association, Philosophy of Science Association, vol 1994, no 2, pp 374–381 311
- Dupré J (2001) Human nature and the limits of science. Clarendon Press, Oxford 312
- Fine B, Milonakis D (2009) From economics imperialism to freakonomics: the shifting boundaries between economics and other social sciences. Routledge, London/New York 313

AU4

AU5

- 339 Fink EM (2003) Post-realism, or the jurisprudential logic
340 of late capitalism: a socio-legal analysis of the rise and
341 diffusion of law and economics. *Hastings LJ*, 55, 931
- 342 Granovetter M, Swedberg R (2001) The sociology of eco-
343 nomic life, 2nd edn. Westview Press, Boulder
- 344 Guilhot N, Marciano A (2018) Rational choice as neo-
345 decisionism. In: *Scientific imperialism: exploring the*
346 *boundaries of interdisciplinarity*
- 347 Harnay S, Marciano A (2009) Posner, economics and the
348 law: from “law and economics” to an economic analy-
349 sis of law. *J Hist Econ Thought* 31(2):215–232
- 350 Hirshleifer J (1985) The expanding domain of economics.
351 *Am Econ Rev* 75(6):53–68
- 352 Hodgson GM (1994) Some remarks on ‘economic
353 imperialism’ and international political economy. *Rev*
354 *Int Polit Econ* 1(1):21–28
- 355 Jackson N (1984) The economic explanation of legal phe-
356 nomena. *Int Rev Law Econ* 4(2):163–183
- 357 Kidd JI (2013) Historical contingency and the impact of
358 scientific imperialism. *Int Stud Philos Sci*
359 27(3):315–324
- 360 Kuorikoski J, Lehtinen A (2010) Economics imperialism
361 and solution concepts in political science. *Philos Soc*
362 *Sci* 40(3):347–374
- 363 Lazear EP (2000) Economic imperialism. *Q J Econ*
364 115(1):99–146
- 365 Mäki U (2009) Economics imperialism: concept and con-
366 straints. *Philos Soc Sci* 39(3):351–380
- 367 Mäki U (2013) Scientific imperialism: difficulties in defi-
368 nition, identification, and assessment. *Int Stud Philos*
369 *Sci* 27(3):325–339
- 370 Mäki U, Marchionni C (2010) Is geographical economics
371 imperializing economic geography? *J Econ Geogr*
372 11(4):645–665
- 373 Mäki U, Walsh A, Pinto MF (eds) (2017) *Scientific impe-*
374 *rialism: exploring the boundaries of interdisciplinarity.*
375 Routledge, Oxon
- 376 Małecka M, Lepenies R (2018) Is the behavioral approach
377 a form of scientific imperialism? An analysis of law and
378 policy. In: Mäki U, Walsh A, Pinto MF (eds) *Scientific*
379 *imperialism: exploring the boundaries of interdisciplin-*
380 *arity.* Routledge, Abingdon
- Marchionatti R, Cedrini M (2016) *Economics as social* 381
382 *science: economics imperialism and the challenge of*
383 *interdisciplinarity.* Taylor & Francis, Basingstoke
- Marino P (2018) Ethical implications of scientific imperi- 384
385 *alism. Two examples from economics. In: Scientific*
386 *imperialism: exploring the boundaries of*
387 *interdisciplinarity*
- Medema SG (2015) From dismal to dominance? Law and 388
389 *economics: philosophical issues and fundamental ques-*
390 *tions* 22: 69
- Medema SG (2018) Scientific imperialism or merely 391
392 *boundary crossing? In: Scientific imperialism: explor-*
393 *ing the boundaries of interdisciplinarity*
- Mercurio N, Medema SG (2006) *Economics and the law:* 394
395 *from posner to postmodernism and beyond, 2nd edn*
- Nik-Khah E, Van Horn R (2012) *Inland empire: economics* 396
397 *imperialism as an imperative of Chicago neoliberalism.*
398 *J Econ Methodol* 19(3):259–282
- Pearson H (1997) *Origins of law and economics: the econ-* 399
400 *omists’ new science of law, 1830–1930.* Cambridge
401 University Press, New York
- Posner R (1989) Foreword. In: Faure M, van den Bergh 402
403 R (eds) *Essays in law and economics: corporations, accident*
404 *prevention and compensation for losses.*
405 Maklu, Antwerpen
- Radnitzky G, Bernholz P (eds) (1987) *Economic imperial-* 406
407 *ism: the economic approach applied outside the field of*
408 *economics.* Paragon House Publishers, New York
- Sigelman L, Goldfarb R (2012) The influence of econom- 409
410 *ics on political science: by what pathway? J Econ*
411 *Methodol* 19(1):1–19
- Stigler GJ (1984) Economics: the imperial science? *Scand* 412
413 *J Econ* 86(3):301–313
- Swedberg R (1990) *Economics and sociology: redefining* 414
415 *their boundaries: conversations with economists and*
416 *sociologists.* Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Tullock G (1972) *Economic imperialism. In: Theory of* 417
418 *public choice.* pp 317–29
- Vromen JJ (2009) The booming economics-made-fun 419
420 *genre: more than having fun, but less than economics*
421 *imperialism.* *Erasmus J Philos Econ* 2(1):70–99

Author Queries

Encyclopedia of Law and Economics Chapter No.: 741-1

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please be aware that your name and affiliation and if applicable those of you co-author(s) will be published as presented in this proof. If you want to make any changes, please correct the details now. Note that corrections after publication will no longer be possible.	yes, it's ok
AU2	Please provide synonyms.	synonyms to which word?
AU3	Mäki et al. 2018 has been changed to Mäki et al. 2017 here and in other occurrences as per the reference list. Please check if okay.	It should be 2018
AU4	Please provide editors and publisher details for Amadae (2018), Chassonnery-Zaïgouche (2018), Davis (2012), Guilhot and Marciano (2018), Marino (2018), Medema (2018), Tullock (1972), Zaïgouche (2018).	Routledge: Amadae, Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, Guilhot and Marciano, Marino, Medema, Davis The University of Michigan Press: Tullock
AU5	Please provide publisher details for Davis (2012), Mercuro and Medema (2006).	Davis - Routledge Mercuro and Medema -Princeton University Press
AU6	Please check if the inserted publisher location is okay.	yes

Note:

If you are using material from other works please make sure that you have obtained the necessary permission from the copyright holders and that references to the original publications are included.