

## Lecture Quote<sup>1</sup>: Free Speech and Extremism: Constitution and Deliberation

Explore the boundary of knowledge-On Epistemology

1. Extremism is the product of social influence and networks  
Your theory of knowledge (understanding of ideas) is shaped by the environment you are in.
2. Crippled Epistemology  
What if you are in the extreme situation? I.e., all those around you keep extreme ideology/belief.
3. Information matters (a lot)  
Exposure to social media/social sites affects one's ideology much.
4. Reputation/Influence matter  
Whether this idea is insightful depends on the person who present it.
5. Free speech sometimes extremism  
See what D. Trump has done in the campaign.

The classic Asch conformity experiments as an illustration of the cause of extremism. It seems right since everyone says it.

Cultural difference between Risk inclination:

American experimentees show more risk-inclined in the group; instead, Taiwanese counterpart are more risk-averse as acting in the group. This result always stands as a good example there are different cultural influences.

Rather than cultural difference, it should be an example of extremism. They are polarized. Their personality goes towards the extreme.

Constant exposure to the same environment => Group polarization.

Why Conspiracy theories survive even though they seem so ridiculous?

Bandwagon effect

Assimilation bias: the interpretation we made of new thing depends on the old belief we hold.

Balanced presentation helps

Exposure to different viewpoints prevent the group polarization.

Human right and Human dignity

We cannot exclude the possibility that free speech breeds extremism, but we want to protect the freedom of speech => In which case can we restrict the freedom of speech?

Speech which incites clear and present danger (which may direct to induce imminent lawless action)

---

<sup>1</sup> I am sorry this part is fractional, even the voice record is blurred.

Lecture Quote: Frontiers of Behavioral Law and Economics

The prominence of behavioral science has been noticed.

Examples as:

The U.S.A has set up a social & behavioral team since 2014.

WB uses behavioral science for economic development.

Availability heuristic<sup>2</sup>

Selective attention test <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJG698U2Mvo>

Limited loading of mental activity

Default setting matters as people are inclined not to change it.

- Choice structure matters a lot in your decision-making.

Incentives sometimes fails. (even with penalty and prison sentences, drunk-driving still prevalent)

The introduction of “nudge<sup>3</sup>”, a social environment that affects people’s choices without imposing coercion or any kind of material incentive.

Ex: Default rule, Disclosure of information, Framing

Q&A:

1. Is there some field that the gov’t should keep its influence from?

Empirical studies show that nudging/default-setting policy has citizens’ support.

For example, a default setting of creationism as the curriculum of Biology in compulsory education will be overturned by the people<sup>4</sup>.

2. Should the usage of nudging be regulated? Take airlines company for example, they often set their travel insurance or hotel booking package bought with the ticket as default, but the package they offer is always more expensive than what you can find by yourself.

---

<sup>2</sup> Compared to the normal setting that homo sapiens knows all his action alternatives

<sup>3</sup> As an example: [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/a0/Nudge\\_Toilet\\_1.jpg](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/a0/Nudge_Toilet_1.jpg)

<sup>4</sup> Even with the empirical result, we cannot rule out the possibility of group polarization influence.

Lecture Quote: Autonomy, Freedom of Choice, and Civic Republicanism<sup>5</sup>

The value of choice

Dissect the arguments supporting the freedom of choice into three parts.

- i. Welfare
- ii. Dignity
- iii. Autonomy

The core of republicanism => self-government and civic virtue

Can we analyze the “Preference of Preference”?

How can we solve the problem induced by the endogeneity of preferences?

Ulysses and the sirens<sup>6</sup>

Sometimes we may choose “not to choose”

1. Doctor & patients
2. Retirement/Healthcare plans
3. Privacy
4. Energy
5. Predictive shopping

Civic republican default rules

Active choosing vs. Impersonal default rule

Active choosing vs. Personalized defaults

Four proposition (Here we assume that the choice architect is fully trusted.)

1. I.D. is preferred to A.C. when:
  - i. Confusing/unfamiliar context
  - ii. People choose not to choose
  - iii. Learning effect not important
  - iv. Population not heterogeneous along any dimension
2. A.C. is preferred to I.D. when:
  - i. Choice architects are biased/lack important information
  - ii. Choice is done in familiar context
  - iii. People choose to choose
3. P.D. is preferred to I.D. when citizens faced by relevant heterogeneity
4. P.D. have major advantages over A.C. due to the saving of “making choice cost”

2 Decision making systems

Intuitive vs. Deliberative

Swift vs. Slow

---

<sup>5</sup> This one is the last one as academic talks. It integrates the ideas mentioned in the precedent talks.

<sup>6</sup> See this site for further discussion [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ulysses\\_pact](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ulysses_pact)

Instant and prompt vs. accuracy

What government may harm:

- ◆ Reducing welfare
- ◆ Impairing dignity
- ◆ Impairing Autonomy
- ◆ Alienation of freedom

In defense of A.C.

- Learning (instead of nudging, boost people to enhance their ability)
- Bad choice architect
- The decision-making background may change with time

Should we urge others to make choices?

*As you get wealthier, everything taken care for you, you take less responsibility*

Esther Duflo

Like an additional burden/mandate enforced on the deprived.

Excessive choosing as a burden. E.g., 70 flavors of ice cream or default set.

Type of decision making scenarios

	Fun	Tedious
Easy	Make the choice	Personalized default
Difficult	Learning	Not to choose

Framework:

Our analysis is hinged on:

**decision costs & error costs**

scarcity & bandwidth

thus, if a person chooses not to choose, it is

1. Rational
2. Honorable
3. Welfare-improving

Dignity as the subject

You should choose my choice to choose, as well as “not to choose”

Roman republicanism vs. Representative republicanism

*The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right*