

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS AS HUMAN AFFAIRS

Antonin Scalia

The title of this article—Economic Affairs as Human Affairs—is derived from a phrase I recall from the earliest days of my political awareness. Dwight Eisenhower used to insist, with demonstrably successful effect, that he was “a conservative in economic affairs, but a liberal in human affairs.” I am sure he meant it to connote nothing more profound than that he represented the best of both Republican and Democratic tradition. But still, that seemed to me a peculiar way to put it—contrasting economic affairs with human affairs as though economics is a science developed for the benefit of dogs or trees; something that has nothing to do with human beings, with their welfare, aspirations, or freedoms.

That, of course, is a pernicious notion, though it represents a turn of mind that characterizes much American political thought. It leads to the conclusion that economic rights and liberties are qualitatively distinct from, and fundamentally inferior to, other noble human values called civil rights, about which we should be more generous. Unless one is a thoroughgoing materialist, there is some appeal to this. Surely the freedom to dispose of one’s property as one pleases, for example, is not as high an aspiration as the freedom to think or write or worship as one’s conscience dictates. On closer analysis, however, it seems to me that the difference between economic freedoms and what are generally called civil rights turns out to be a difference of degree rather than of kind. Few of us, I suspect, would have much difficulty choosing between the right to own property and the right to receive a Miranda warning.

Cato Journal, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Winter 1985). Copyright © Cato Institute. All rights reserved.

The author is Circuit Judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit. This paper is an edited version of the author’s remarks delivered at the Cato Institute’s conference “Economic Liberties and the Judiciary,” 26 October 1984.

In any case, in the real world a stark dichotomy between economic freedoms and civil rights does not exist. Human liberties of various types are dependent on one another, and it may well be that the most humble of them is indispensable to the others—the firmament, so to speak, upon which the high spires of the most exalted freedoms ultimately rest. I know no society, today or in any era of history, in which high degrees of intellectual and political freedom have flourished side by side with a high degree of state control over the relevant citizen's economic life. The free market, which presupposes relatively broad economic freedom, has historically been the cradle of broad political freedom, and in modern times the demise of economic freedom has been the grave of political freedom as well. The same phenomenon is observable in the small scales of our private lives. As a practical matter, he who controls my economic destiny controls much more of my life as well. Most salaried professionals do not consider themselves "free" to go about wearing sandals and nehru jackets, or to write letters on any subjects they please to the *New York Times*.

My concern in this essay, however, is not economic liberty in general, but economic liberty and the judiciary. One must approach this topic with the realization that the courts are (in most contexts, at least) hardly disparaging of economic rights and liberties. Although most of the cases you read of in the newspaper may involve busing, or homosexual rights, or the supervision of school districts and mental institutions, the vast bulk of the courts' civil business consists of the vindication of economic rights between private individuals and against the government. Indeed, even the vast bulk of noncriminal "civil rights" cases are really cases involving economic disputes. The legal basis for the plaintiff's claim may be sex discrimination, but what she is really complaining about is that someone did her out of a job. Even the particular court on which I sit, which because of its location probably gets an inordinately large share of civil cases *not* involving economic rights, still finds that the majority of its business consists of enforcing economic rights against the government—the right to conduct business in an unregulated fashion where Congress has authorized no regulation, or the right to receive a fair return upon capital invested in a rate-regulated business. Indeed, some of the economic interests protected by my court are quite rarefied, such as a business's right to remain free of economic competition from a government licensee whose license is defective in a respect having nothing to do with the plaintiff's interests—for example, one radio station's challenge to the license of a competing station on the basis that the latter will produce electronic interference with a third station.

Fundamental or rarefied, the point is that we, the judiciary, do a lot of protecting of economic rights and liberties. The problem that some see is that this protection in the federal courts runs only by and large against the executive branch and not against the Congress. We will ensure that the executive does not impose any constraints upon economic activity which Congress has not authorized; and that where constraints *are* authorized the executive follows statutorily prescribed procedures and that the executive (and, much more rarely, Congress in its prescriptions) follows constitutionally required procedures. But we will never (well, hardly ever) decree that the substance of the congressionally authorized constraint is unlawful. That is to say, we do not provide a *constitutionalized* protection except insofar as matters of process, as opposed to substantive economic rights, are concerned.

There are those who urge reversal of this practice. The main vehicle available—and the only one I address specifically here—is the due process clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, which provides that no person shall be deprived of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” Although one might suppose that a reference to “process” places limitations only upon the *manner* in which a thing may be done, and not upon the *doing* of it, since at least the late 1800s the federal courts have in fact interpreted these clauses to prohibit the *substance* of certain governmental action, no matter what fair and legitimate procedures attend that substance. Thus, there has come to develop a judicial vocabulary which refers (seemingly redundantly) to “procedural due process” on the one hand, and (seemingly paradoxically) to “substantive due process” on the other hand. Until the mid-1930s, substantive due process rights were extended not merely to what we would now term “civil rights”—for example, the freedom to teach one’s child a foreign language if one wishes—but also to a broad range of economic rights—for example, the right to work twelve hours a day if one wishes. Since that time, application of the concept has been consistently expanded in the civil rights field (*Roe v. Wade* is the most controversial recent extension) but entirely eliminated in the field of economic rights. Some urge that it should be resuscitated.

I pause to note at this point, lest I either be credited with what is good in the present system or blamed for what is bad, that it is not up to me. (I did not have to make that disclaimer a few years ago, when I was a law professor.) The Supreme Court decisions rejecting substantive due process in the economic field are clear, unequivocal and current, and as an appellate judge I try to do what I’m told. But I will go beyond that disclaimer and say that in my view the position

the Supreme Court has arrived at is good—or at least that the suggestion that it change its position is even worse.

As should be apparent from what I said above, my position is not based on the proposition that economic rights are unimportant. Nor do I necessarily quarrel with the specific nature of the particular economic rights that the most sagacious of the proponents of substantive due process would bring within the protection of the Constitution; were I a legislator, I might well vote for them. Rather, my skepticism arises from misgivings about, first, the effect of such expansion on the behavior of courts in other areas quite separate from economic liberty, and second, the ability of the courts to limit their constitutionalizing to those elements of economic liberty that are sensible. I will say a few words about each.

First, the effect of constitutionalizing substantive economic guarantees on the behavior of the courts in other areas: There is an inevitable connection between judges' ability and willingness to craft substantive due process guarantees in the economic field and their ability and willingness to do it elsewhere. Many believe—and among those many are some of the same people who urge an expansion of economic due process rights—that our system already suffers from relatively recent constitutionalizing, and thus judicializing, of social judgments that ought better be left to the democratic process. The courts, they feel, have come to be regarded as an alternate legislature, whose charge differs from that of the ordinary legislature in the respect that while the latter may enact into law good ideas, the former may enact into law only *unquestionably* good ideas, which, since they *are* so unquestionably good, *must* be part of the Constitution. I would not adopt such an extravagant description of the problem. But I do believe that every era raises its own peculiar threat to constitutional democracy, and that the attitude of mind thus caricatured represents the distinctive threat of our times. And I therefore believe that whatever reinforces rather than challenges that attitude is to that extent undesirable. It seems to me that the reversal of a half-century of judicial restraint in the economic realm comes within that category. In the long run, and perhaps even in the short run, the reinforcement of mistaken and unconstitutional perceptions of the role of the courts in our system far outweighs whatever evils may have accrued from undue judicial abstention in the economic field.

The response to my concern, I suppose, is that the connection I assert between judicial intervention in the economic realm and in other realms can simply not be shown to exist. We have substantive due process aplenty in the field of civil liberties, even while it has been obliterated in the economic field. My rejoinder is simply an

abiding faith that logic will out. Litigants before me often characterize the argument that if the court does *w* (which is desirable) then it must logically do *x*, *y*, and *z* (which are undesirable) as a "parade of horrors"; but in my years at the law I have too often seen the end of the parade come by. There really is an inevitable tug of logical consistency upon human affairs, and especially upon judicial affairs—indeed, that is the only thing that makes the system work. So I must believe that as bad as some feel judicial "activism" has gotten without substantive due process in the economic field, *absent* that memento of judicial humility it might have gotten even worse. And I have little hope that judicial and lawyerly attitudes can be coaxed back to a more restricted view of the courts' role in a democratic society at the same time that we are charging forward on an entirely new front.

Though it is something of an oversimplification, I do not think it unfair to say that this issue presents the moment of truth for many conservatives who have been criticizing the courts in recent years. They must decide whether they really believe, as they have been saying, that the courts are doing too much, or whether they are actually nursing only the less principled grievance that the courts have not been doing what *they* want.

The second reason for my skepticism is the absence of any reason to believe that the courts would limit their constitutionalizing of economic rights to those rights that are sensible. In this regard some conservatives seem to make the same mistake they so persuasively argue the society makes whenever it unthinkingly calls in government regulation to remedy a "market failure." It is first necessary to make sure, they have persuaded us, that the cure is not worse than the disease—that the phenomenon of "government failure," attributable to the fact that the government, like the market, happens to be composed of self-interested human beings, will not leave the last state of the problem worse than the first. It strikes me as peculiar that these same rational free-market proponents will unthinkingly call in the courts as a *deus ex machina* to solve what they perceive as the problems of democratic inadequacy in the field of economic rights. Is there much reason to believe that the courts, if they undertook the task, would do a good job? If economic sophistication is the touchstone, it suffices to observe that these are the folks who developed three-quarters of a century of counterproductive law under the Sherman Act. But perhaps what counts is not economic sophistication, but rather a favoritism—not shared by the political branches of government—toward the institution of property and its protection. I have no doubt that judges once met this qualification. When Madison described them as a "natural aristocracy," I am sure he had in mind

an aristocracy of property as well as of manners. But with the proliferation and consequent bureaucratization of the courts, the relative modesty of judicial salaries, and above all the development of lawyers (and hence of judges) through a system of generally available university education which, in this country as in others, more often nurtures collectivist than capitalist philosophy, one would be foolish to look for Daddy Warbucks on the bench.

But, the proponents of constitutionalized economic rights will object, we do not propose an open-ended, unlimited charter to the courts to create economic rights, but would tie the content of those rights to the text of the Constitution and, where the text is itself somewhat open-ended (the due process clause, for example), to established (if recently forgotten) constitutional traditions. As a theoretical matter, that could be done—though it is infinitely more difficult today than it was fifty years ago. Because of the courts' long retirement from the field of constitutional economics, and because of judicial and legislative developments in other fields, the social consensus as to what are the limited, "core" economic rights does not exist today as it perhaps once did. But even if it is theoretically possible for the courts to mark out limits to their intervention, it is hard to be confident that they would do so. We may find ourselves burdened with judicially prescribed economic liberties that are worse than the pre-existing economic bondage. What would you think, for example, of a substantive-due-process, constitutionally guaranteed, economic right of every worker to "just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity?" Many think this a precept of natural law; why not of the Constitution? A sort of constitutionally prescribed (and thus judicially determined) minimum wage. Lest it be thought fanciful, I have taken the formulation of this right verbatim from Article 23 of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Finally, let me suggest that the call for creating (or, if you prefer, "reestablishing") economic constitutional guarantees mistakes the nature and effect of the constitutionalizing process. To some degree, a constitutional guarantee is like a commercial loan: you can only get it if, at the time, you don't really need it. The most important, enduring, and stable portions of the Constitution represent such a deep social consensus that one suspects that if they were entirely eliminated, very little would change. And the converse is also true. A guarantee may appear in the words of the Constitution, but when the society ceases to possess an abiding belief in it, it has no living effect. Consider the fate of the principle expressed in the Tenth Amendment that the federal government is a government of limited powers. I do

not suggest that constitutionalization has no effect in helping the society to preserve allegiance to its fundamental principles. That is the whole purpose of a constitution. But the allegiance comes first and the preservation afterwards.

Most of the constitutionalizing of civil rights that the courts have effected in recent years has been at the margins of well-established and deeply held social beliefs. Even *Brown v. Board of Education*, as significant a step as it might have seemed, was only an elaboration of the consequences of the nation's deep belief in the equality of all persons before the law. Where the Court has tried to go further than that (the unsuccessful attempt to eliminate the death penalty, to take one of the currently less controversial examples), the results have been precarious. Unless I have been on the bench so long that I no longer have any feel for popular sentiment, I do not detect the sort of national commitment to most of the economic liberties generally discussed that would enable even an activist court to constitutionalize them. That lack of sentiment may be regrettable, but to seek to develop it by enshrining the unaccepted principles in the Constitution is to place the cart before the horse.

If you are interested in economic liberties, then, the first step is to recall the society to that belief in their importance which (I have no doubt) the founders of the republic shared. That may be no simple task, because the roots of the problem extend as deeply into modern theology as into modern social thought. I remember a conversation with Irving Kristol some years ago, in which he expressed gratitude that his half of the Judeo-Christian heritage had never thought it a sin to be rich. In fact my half never thought it so either. Voluntary poverty, like voluntary celibacy, was a counsel of perfection—but it was not thought that either wealth or marriage was inherently evil, or a condition that the just society should seek to stamp out. But that subtle distinction has assuredly been forgotten, and we live in an age in which many Christians are predisposed to believe that John D. Rockefeller, for all his piety (he founded the University of Chicago as a Baptist institution), is likely to be damned and Ché Guevara, for all his nonbelief, is likely to be among the elect. This suggests that the task of creating what I might call a constitutional ethos of economic liberty is no easy one. But it is the first task.