



From the MixCache.com library

SAMPLE COPY

Judicial Power and Politics: Courts, Controversy, and Constitutional Change

MixCache.com

SAMPLE COPY

Table of Contents

- **Introduction**
- **Chapter 1** Mapping Judicial Power: Concepts, Boundaries, and Legitimacy
- **Chapter 2** Theories of Judicial Behavior: Attitudinal, Strategic, and Legal Models
- **Chapter 3** Empirical Tools for Studying Courts: Data, Identification, and Causality
- **Chapter 4** Judicial Selection in the United States: From Merit to Politics
- **Chapter 5** Nomination Battles: Strategies, Messaging, and Senate Dynamics
- **Chapter 6** Filibusters, Blue Slips, and Procedural Hardball
- **Chapter 7** Court-Packing Then and Now: Lessons from the New Deal to the Present
- **Chapter 8** Comparative Court-Packing and Judicial Overhaul Abroad
- **Chapter 9** Agenda-Setting and Docket Control: The Shadow of the Certiorari Process
- **Chapter 10** Opinion Assignment, Coalition Formation, and Bargaining on Collegial Courts
- **Chapter 11** Lower Federal Courts and the Implementation of Supreme Court Doctrine
- **Chapter 12** State Courts: Elections, Campaign Finance, and Accountability Pressures
- **Chapter 13** Interest Groups, Amicus Briefs, and the Mobilization of Law
- **Chapter 14** Public Opinion, Media Ecosystems, and Judicial Legitimacy
- **Chapter 15** Executive Power, Emergency Authority, and Deference Doctrines
- **Chapter 16** Legislative-Judicial Conflict: Jurisdiction Stripping and Overrides
- **Chapter 17** Constitutional Change through Litigation: Pathways and Constraints
- **Chapter 18** Precedent, Stare Decisis, and Ideological Drift
- **Chapter 19** The Administrative State, Chevron's Fate, and Judicial Review of Agencies
- **Chapter 20** Ethics, Recusal, and the Problem of Self-Policing
- **Chapter 21** Transparency, Disclosure, and the Role of Technology
- **Chapter 22** Tenure, Term Limits, and Retirement Design
- **Chapter 23** Designing Appointment Systems: Commissions, Confirmation, and Diversity
- **Chapter 24** Safeguarding Court Capacity: Budgets, Dockets, and Institutional Resilience
- **Chapter 25** A Reform Agenda: Principles, Tradeoffs, and Implementation

Introduction

Courts occupy a paradoxical position in constitutional democracies. They are empowered to say what the law is, yet they must do so without becoming just another site of partisan warfare. This book takes that paradox seriously. It examines how judicial power is acquired, exercised, contested, and protected, and why moments of controversy—from bruising nomination fights to proposals for court expansion—can either recalibrate or destabilize the constitutional order.

Our approach is empirical and historical. We combine quantitative studies of judicial behavior with archival materials, legislative records, and comparative case studies. By tracing the logic of nomination battles, the rhetoric and realities of court-packing debates, and the microdynamics of decision-making on multimember courts, we seek to move beyond slogans and toward evidence-based explanations. Throughout, we ask not only what courts do, but why they do it, how other institutions respond, and with what consequences for rights, governance, and legitimacy.

Central to the book are three concepts that often talk past one another in public debate: politicization, independence, and impartiality. Politicization refers to the growing use of institutional hardball and message discipline around the courts; independence to the insulation necessary for judges to decide cases without fear or favor; impartiality to the normative commitment that legal reasons, rather than partisan interests, should guide outcomes. These values sometimes converge and sometimes collide. Understanding their tradeoffs requires careful attention to institutional design, incentives, and the information environment in which judges work.

Methodologically, we emphasize clean identification strategies and transparent research practices. Readers will encounter analyses of roll-call votes on confirmations, models of strategic opinion writing, and data on the effects of selection systems and campaign finance on state-court behavior. We also mine landmark historical episodes for lessons that resist easy generalization: why some court-curbing efforts backfired, how others succeeded, and what those trajectories suggest about present reform proposals.

The chapters proceed from foundations to frontiers. We start with competing theories of judicial behavior and the conceptual boundaries of judicial power. We then turn to the institutions that shape who becomes a judge and how courts make decisions: selection mechanisms, agenda control, bargaining, and precedent. Subsequent chapters analyze the external pressures—from executives, legislatures, interest groups, and the public—that shape judicial outputs and legitimacy. We end with a set of policy proposals aimed at preserving impartial adjudication in polarized times.

Those proposals are deliberately pragmatic. They include tenure reforms such as staggered fixed terms that regularize appointments while preserving decisional independence; modernized ethics and recusal standards administered by bodies with genuine investigative capacity; disclosure and transparency measures that illuminate financial interests, shadow-docket activity, and third-party influence; and institutional supports that protect court capacity, from stable budgets to data-informed docket management. Each reform is evaluated for benefits, risks, and implementation pathways, with attention to constitutional constraints and comparative experience.

This is an advanced study for students of law and political science, practitioners who engage the courts, journalists who explain them, and citizens who rely on them. Our aim is neither to romanticize nor to disparage the judiciary, but to understand it as a set of institutions populated by strategic actors operating within legal and political constraints. If we succeed, readers will come away with sharper tools to diagnose controversy, a clearer view of how constitutional change often travels through the courts, and a realistic blueprint for protecting judicial independence without abandoning democratic accountability.

SAMPLE COPY

CHAPTER ONE: Mapping Judicial Power: Concepts, Boundaries, and Legitimacy

Judicial power, at first glance, seems straightforward: courts interpret and apply the law. Yet, beneath this seemingly simple definition lies a complex web of concepts, inherent boundaries, and constant struggles for legitimacy. Unlike the legislative branch, which wields the power of the purse and the sword, or the executive, with its vast administrative apparatus and command over the military, the judiciary fundamentally relies on persuasion and the tacit consent of the governed. As Alexander Hamilton famously put it in Federalist No. 78, the judiciary has "no influence over either the sword or the purse; no direction either of the strength or of the wealth of the society; and can take no active resolution whatever." Its power, he concluded, "may truly be said to have neither FORCE nor WILL, but merely judgment." This "judgment" and its acceptance are the bedrock of judicial authority.

The concept of judicial power isn't monolithic; it encompasses several distinct but interrelated dimensions. At its core is the power of judicial review – the authority of courts to declare acts of the legislative and executive branches unconstitutional. While often associated with the landmark American case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), the idea of courts scrutinizing the legality of governmental action has deeper roots and various manifestations across different legal systems. In some countries, constitutional review is concentrated in specialized constitutional courts, while in others, like the United States, it is dispersed among all courts. The very existence and scope of judicial review frequently ignite passionate debates, particularly when courts strike down popular legislation or challenge executive policies.

Beyond judicial review, judicial power includes the ability to interpret statutes, develop common law principles, and establish procedural rules that govern the legal process. Each of these facets contributes to the judiciary's capacity to shape public policy and individual rights. Statutory interpretation, for instance, can profoundly alter the practical effect of legislative enactments, sometimes leading to outcomes far removed from what legislators might have initially intended. The evolution of common law, particularly in areas like torts or contracts, demonstrates how courts can incrementally build and refine legal frameworks over centuries, responding to societal changes and new challenges without direct legislative intervention.

However, judicial power is not boundless. Its most significant constraint is its reactive nature. Courts generally cannot initiate cases; they must wait for litigants to bring disputes before them. This "case or controversy" requirement, deeply embedded in Anglo-American legal tradition, ensures that judicial pronouncements arise from

concrete disputes rather than abstract legal questions or hypothetical scenarios. This limitation, while seemingly procedural, is fundamental to preserving the judiciary's legitimacy, preventing it from becoming an advisory body for other branches of government or a proactive policymaker. The requirement reinforces the idea that judges resolve actual conflicts, grounding their decisions in specific facts and established legal principles.

Another crucial boundary lies in the principle of *stare decisis*, the doctrine of precedent, which dictates that courts should generally adhere to previous rulings. While not an absolute command, *stare decisis* provides a degree of predictability and stability to the law, fostering public confidence in the judicial system's fairness and consistency. Yet, the flexibility inherent in *stare decisis* also allows for judicial evolution. Courts can distinguish prior cases based on factual differences or, in rare instances, explicitly overturn precedent, particularly when societal values shift or when a prior ruling is deemed fundamentally flawed. These moments of overturning precedent often become flashpoints of controversy, attracting intense scrutiny and accusations of judicial overreach.

The legitimacy of judicial power is perhaps its most elusive and critical aspect. Legitimacy, in this context, refers to the public's acceptance of the judiciary's authority and its willingness to abide by court decisions, even when those decisions are unpopular. Unlike elected officials, judges derive their authority not from direct democratic mandate but from their perceived impartiality, reasoned judgment, and adherence to the rule of law. When courts are seen as acting politically, or their decisions appear arbitrary or ideologically driven, their legitimacy erodes, making it harder for them to enforce their judgments and maintain their institutional standing.

Historical examples abound where judicial legitimacy has been tested. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857), which declared African Americans were not citizens and that Congress could not prohibit slavery in territories, severely damaged the Court's standing and is often cited as a contributing factor to the outbreak of the Civil War. More recently, controversies surrounding specific rulings, judicial appointments, or even the perceived political leanings of individual judges have fueled public debate about the proper role of courts in a democratic society. These episodes underscore the delicate balance courts must maintain to preserve their institutional capital.

The concept of judicial power also varies significantly across different political systems. In parliamentary democracies, where legislative supremacy is often the guiding principle, judicial review might be less robust or exercised by specialized constitutional courts operating within stricter parameters. For instance, in the United Kingdom, while courts interpret statutes, the concept of parliamentary sovereignty historically meant that judges could not strike down an Act of Parliament as unconstitutional. However, even in such systems, the influence of international human

rights treaties and evolving legal norms has led to a gradual expansion of judicial scrutiny over governmental actions.

Conversely, in federal systems like the United States or Germany, courts play a crucial role in arbitrating disputes between different levels of government, defining the boundaries of federal and state authority. This jurisdictional aspect of judicial power is essential for maintaining the balance of power within a federal structure, preventing either the central government or the constituent states from overstepping their constitutional prerogatives. These decisions, while often technical, have profound implications for governance and public policy, shaping everything from environmental regulations to healthcare policies.

The relationship between judicial power and other branches of government is inherently dynamic and often characterized by tension. Legislatures can pass new laws to overturn judicial interpretations of statutes, or they can propose constitutional amendments to reverse constitutional rulings. The executive branch plays a critical role in enforcing judicial decisions and appointing judges, which can profoundly shape the judiciary's future direction. These inter-branch dynamics are not merely theoretical; they represent a constant push and pull, a negotiation of authority that defines the practical limits and influence of judicial power in a functioning democracy.

Understanding these concepts – judicial review, statutory interpretation, common law development, and the inherent boundaries of reactivity and precedent – is the first step toward grasping the complexities of judicial power. Recognizing the fragile nature of judicial legitimacy and the varied ways it is constructed and maintained across different political systems is equally vital. This foundational understanding allows us to delve deeper into the specific mechanisms and controversies that animate the study of courts, controversy, and constitutional change, as explored in the subsequent chapters of this book. We will examine how these fundamental aspects of judicial power are tested and transformed through nomination battles, court-packing debates, and the daily grind of judicial decision-making.

Furthermore, the very language used to describe judicial power often carries ideological baggage. Terms like "judicial activism" or "judicial restraint" are frequently deployed as political weapons, obscuring nuanced legal arguments with emotionally charged rhetoric. A genuinely scholarly approach requires moving beyond these often-simplistic labels to analyze the specific methods of interpretation, the evidence presented, and the reasoning employed by judges in their decisions. This involves understanding that what one observer might call "activism" another might see as a principled defense of constitutional rights or a necessary adaptation of law to modern realities.

The allocation of judicial power within a legal system also influences its impact. For example, a single, powerful supreme court with the final say on constitutional matters

will have a different kind of influence than a system where constitutional questions can be reviewed by various specialized tribunals or where decisions are subject to greater legislative override. The institutional design itself acts as a constraint or an enabler of judicial power, shaping how effectively courts can assert their authority and how easily their decisions can be challenged or circumvented by other governmental actors.

Ultimately, mapping judicial power involves acknowledging its inherent contradictions. It is a power derived from reason and impartiality, yet constantly susceptible to political pressures and public opinion. It is a power designed to uphold the law, yet it inevitably shapes the law through interpretation and application. And it is a power that relies on the consent of the governed, a consent that must be continuously earned through transparent processes, reasoned judgments, and a steadfast commitment to the principles of justice. This foundational chapter sets the stage for a deeper exploration of how these tensions play out in real-world scenarios, influencing everything from individual rights to the very structure of constitutional governance.

SAMPLE COPY

This is a sample preview. Purchase the book to read the full content.

Visit MixCache.com to purchase the complete book.

SAMPLE COPY