

lot cost but conc camp guards  
& and punish w/ the shits

harm / ven  
is it aff every - N's test

you a your resource.  
e.g. my shoe / yr shoe  
or  
Fred's ex of prop.

Why isn't the info B has his resource?  
that's the lib arg  
arg it isn't.

(who owns it  
Lindgr: 3rd party  
Me: victim  
~~clearly not~~  
Libertarian: bk

But incl - even if it were L  
is better off out of it.  
B is worse off for the ex of  
B & his res → harm

consent / coercion

acad  
general

Lib - anything they have can use  
as leverage. But in fact it's a  
normative inquiry.

The act must  
be decent to  
to

Whats diff ① subset of harm  
for it to thru / harm  
restricted options  
also ② consent to whole course of  
cond. (lib defense of all inst.)

To do [sources]

1-1-93

Lindg etc on P. Rt.

WWT ref / S & S

Fletcher / Posner - accuracy  
other cites - chk thru material.

check ~~resour~~ "res" ref -

transfer part disc: include?

add - irrational contracts - OWENS  
& Ginsburg (see 23-24)

Claim-of right defenses. Lindgren 676-80

(shd be legalized if not)

The prop rt anal

cf Lindgren at 688

Incentives to dig up info - is really Grundy

Eps main object was something else - that  
vis deny a red fbmail is assisting. Id at 564

On this sort of theory also.

See Waldron (this sym)

Re EOO - may want  
to refute L's attack on B - (95-6)

its not greater T costs (197) but wasted cuz no  
- public cloud

# Deontic

2 calls  $N$ 's "unproductive" than Economic

699

Jim's counter-ex tree falling 699

(note 1 don't use V's desert -  
except to say it's V's advantage)

Tree ex: felled by card 2  
if trans forbidden  $\Delta$  who  
not want to settle it worse off

Add in intro

making the deontic  
case clear

baseline

right SO or "usual"  
|  
N's old  
concrete  
place  
|  
general

not empir but normative