

Contents

I. Introduction	11
1. Peer Disagreement in Law	13
2. Deep Disagreements	15
3. Chapter Summary	15
4. Limitations	16
II. Supreme Court: Hobby Lobby	17
1. The Battle for Universal Health Care	17
2. The Hobby Lobby Case	18
a) Oral Argument	19
b) The Decision	20
c) Summary of Decision Grounds	20
3. The Disagreements Involved in the Hobby Lobby Case	21
4. The Disagreements in Detail	23
a) Are Closely Held Corporations Persons under the RFRA?	23
b) Can Closely Held For-Profit Corporations Engage in Religious Exercise?	24
c) Does the Contraceptive Mandate Substantially Burden the Exercise of Religion?	25
d) Is the Mandate the Least Restrictive Means of Furthering a Compelling Governmental Interest?	27
e) What Are the Consequences of the Decision for Similar Cases?	28
5. Overview of the Sources of Disagreement	29
6. Analysis Disagreements	30
a) Closely Held Corporations as Persons Exercising Religion under the RFRA	30
b) Contraceptive Mandate as a Substantial Burden to the Exercise of Religion	34
c) Mandate as the Least Restrictive Means of Furthering Compelling Interest	37
d) Consequences of the Decision	40
7. The Contraception Mandate Debate: Deep Disagreements	41

III. Bundesverfassungsgericht: Incest	44
1. Incest and the Criminal Law	44
a) Occurrence of Incest	45
b) Contested Ban	45
2. The Incest Case	48
a) The Decision	49
b) Summary of Decision Grounds	49
3. The Disagreements Involved in Incest	50
4. Disagreements in Detail	52
a) What Were the Legislature's Objectives When Enacting the Statute?	52
b) Can These Objectives Justify a Criminal Provision?	54
c) Is the Provision an Adequate Means to Foster the Desired Objectives?	55
d) Do as Effective but Less Restrictive Means Exist?	57
e) Is § 173.2 Sentence 2 StGB Proportionate in the Narrower Sense?	58
5. Overview Sources of Disagreement	59
6. Analysis Disagreements	60
a) The Objectives of the Norm	60
b) Can these Objectives Justify a Criminal Norm?	63
c) Is the Norm an Adequate Means?	67
aa) Protection of the Family	67
bb) Right to Sexual Self-Determination	68
cc) Protection of Public Health	69
d) A Less Restrictive but as Effective Means	70
e) Proportionality in the Narrower Sense	71
7. The Incest Debate: Deep Disagreements	72
IV. Disagreeing Justices	74
1. Peer Disagreement and Disagreeing Justices	74
a) Justices as Epistemic Peers	74
aa) They Must Know the Evidence	75
bb) Experts in the Law	76
cc) Overall Conditions are the Same, or Similar Enough	76
dd) Conclusion	78
b) Peer Disagreement as Higher Order Evidence	78

c) Specifics of Legal Disagreement	79
d) Peer Disagreement in Law	81
aa) Disagreement Is Nothing New in Supreme Courts	82
bb) Disagreement Is No Permissible Evidence	82
cc) Reasons v. Votes	83
dd) Individual Judgment Plays a Greater Role	84
ee) Disagreement Is No Indication of a Performance Error	84
e) Summary	85
2. Ideology and Disagreeing Justices	86
a) Ideological Explanations	87
b) Can Ideology Alone Explain Disagreements Among Justices?	88
aa) Hobby Lobby at the Supreme Court	89
bb) Incest at the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i>	91
cc) General Argument	92
c) Summary	94
3. Conclusion	95
V. Dealing with Disagreement	97
1. Legal Practice	97
a) Institutional Role Model	97
b) How Should Disagreement Affect Justices?	98
aa) Reexamine	98
bb) Seeking New Evidence	100
cc) Identifying Common Ground	100
dd) Finding Clarity	101
c) Specific Constellations	102
d) Summary	102
2. Legal Policy	103
a) Status Quo	103
aa) Supreme Court	103
bb) <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i>	104
b) Room for Improvement	105
c) Reaching a Legitimate Decision	108
aa) Majority Decision	108
bb) Lottery	110
cc) Consensus	110

d) Summary	111
3. Legal Disagreement and Philosophy	111
a) What Should Justices Believe and What Should They Do?	112
b) The Majority Vote Is the Best Decision Mechanism Available	113
c) Two Kinds of Suspension	114
References	116
Index	125