

Striking Balance in Democratic Governance: The Battle for Control between the Administrative and Legal Branches

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v5i2.883>

| Yaron Katz |

Holon Institute of Technology,
Israel

aron@ykatz.com



This work is licensed
under a Creative Commons Attribution-
ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

ABSTRACT

The perception of the role of the court in democracy is a complex and frequently debated aspect of political systems. It involves how individuals, institutions, and society at large view the function, powers, and responsibilities of the judiciary within the broader democratic framework. The role of the court is deeply intertwined with the principle of separation of powers, which delineates distinct functions for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. However, the perception of the court's role in shaping and influencing public policies is a subject of discussion, since the effectiveness of the court in a democracy is closely linked to public trust and legitimacy. Prominent researches argue that the court should actively contribute to policy development, while others believe that its primary function should be limited to interpreting and applying existing laws. As a result, debates often arise over the extent to which the court should exercise its power of judicial review. A perceived lack of impartiality, independence, or transparency can erode public trust, impacting the credibility of the court's decisions and its overall role in democratic governance. While courts have the authority to render judgments, their ability to enforce decisions and ensure compliance with the rule of law relies on the cooperation of other branches and societal actors. The research highlights contrasting viewpoints on the court's responsibility in safeguarding constitutional principles through the rejection of legislative and executive actions that contradict constitutional norms. The core issue revolves around the significance of this and whether it presents a potential threat by enabling the court to supersede decisions made by duly elected representatives of the public.

KEYWORDS

court; democracy; political system; society

INTRODUCTION

The discernment of the part of the court in popular government has been in steady wrangle about in numerous vote-based systems, emphasizing the battle for control between the authoritative and legal branches. It reflects the ongoing dialogue about the proper role of the judiciary in balancing powers, protecting individual rights, and contributing to the overall sustainability of democratic systems. Public discourse and debates about these issues contribute to the dynamic nature of the perception of the court within democratic societies, since the dependence on courts for tending to open arrangement questions and political contentions may be a central wonder in modern vote-based systems (Filgueiras, 2013).

The inquire about highlights the differentiated sees of the part of courts to preserve the control of legal audit by declining administrative and official activity on the premise of a

struggle with sacred standards. Supporters of judicial supremacy argue for a robust court authority to counterbalance potential encroachments on judicial independence. Conversely, proponents of legislative authority posit concerns about the growing judicialization of politics, emphasizing the need for elected representatives to hold sway over democratic decisions and supporting the authority of legislators to counter court decisions. A mediating standpoint suggests that the court is anticipated to safeguard democratic systems and human rights. Recognizing the court's vital role in upholding democratic systems, this approach acknowledges that the steadiness of a majority rule government pivots on open back for its teach.

The examination of this research concentrates on the perception of the role of courts within democratic systems. This perception has become a focal point of extensive debate, reflecting the interplay between the legislative and judicial branches in numerous democracies worldwide. The multifaceted nature of this discourse emerges from the tension between larger part control and minority rights, as well as the evolving dynamics of democratic governance. Scholars and analysts have explored contrasting perspectives, advocating for the supremacy of courts as a check on legislative and executive actions, while others highlight the potential pitfalls of judicial activism, framing it as a form of the politicization of the legal sphere.

Consequently, it is argued that the role of the court within a democratic framework is crucial, and perceptions of this role can vary based on political, cultural, and historical contexts which are relevant to each country. Durbach, Reinecke & Dargan (2020) clarify that courts nowadays perform a double work of the partition of powers to law-based administration: the primary obligation of legal survey is to act as a check on the work out of state control, and the moment obligation is to ensure person rights and interface that have been abused. However, while the perception of courts as protectors of individual rights is widely recognized, debates persist about the appropriate extent of judicial activism, the balance between individual rights and societal interests, and the role of the judiciary in shaping legal and social norms within a democratic society.

This discourse raises a crucial dilemma regarding the establishment of checks and balances that ensure democratic governance while equally protecting minority rights. Hence, the issue that's investigated here is in case the control of the court plays an critical part in a majority rule society or undermines vote based system by permitting the court to overcome choices made by chosen agents of the open?

The debate revolves around the separation of powers and raises another key issue. Therefore, the issue that is further explored is if decision-making should be entrusted to politicians who secure a majority of votes, or should judiciaries act as a check, safeguarding the rights of minorities and upholding the rule of law?

RESEARCH METHODS

Judicial Review

Inside them to begin with obligation, to act as a check on the work out of state control, courts are seen as central players in any political framework. Their duty judicial review is to maintain a functioning democratic order, serving as forums for the resolution of political and social disputes. Barroso (2019) posits that courts contribute to political judicialization, asserting that judicial activism blurs the line between law and politics. As explained by Dershowitz (2023), the traditional role of non-elected courts is to serve as a check on elected politicians who represent the majority by providing a legal avenue for individuals and groups to address grievances, challenge government actions, and seek justice. This is explained by

Bowie (2021) whatever is required by law, the law must be followed by judges through their own understanding and interpretation is an obligation and responsibility in court.

The concept that the court is looked a list on the power of the other some various of government, particularly the legislative and executive branches, is rooted in the idea of maintaining a balance of power to prevent any single branch from becoming too dominant (Barroso, 2019). Courts play a significant part in deciphering and maintaining sacred rights, guaranteeing that government's activities do not encroach upon the rights of citizens. The court is responsible for interpreting the law and determining the constitutionality of laws and government actions. This power gives the court a significant role in shaping the legal and political landscape of a country. Advocating for the court's supremacy over legislators, Sanchez Urribarri (2018) contends that the shift towards authoritarianism often grants governments greater leeway to diminish judicial independence and power.

Courts are seen as guardians of democracy, ensuring that democracy principles are upheld and that supremacy of law applies. They may intervene to protect democratic processes, such as fair elections and safeguarding democratic ideals. They also have the authority to review the constitutionality of laws, executive actions, and governmental policies. Prendergast (2019) explores the necessity for courts to mediate in forming political forms, concluding that the judicial role is crucial in protecting democracy from populist movements that claim to express the will of the people against the political establishment.

The inquire about contends that control of legal survey plays a urgent portion in keeping up a delicate alter of powers interior a larger part run the show system. Judicial review refers to the authority of the judiciary to examine and potentially invalidate laws, executive actions, or government policies that are deemed unconstitutional. This power contributes to the intricate equilibrium among the three branches of government, including executive, legislative, and judicial, by serving as a check on potential abuses of power and ensuring the protection of constitutional principles (Wolterstorff and Cuneo, 2012).

Legal audit of political choices alludes to the control of courts to look at and assess the defendability of administrative and official activities, counting laws. This authority allows courts to assess whether these actions comply with the provisions and principles outlined in the constitution. The power of judicial review is closely tied to the concept of the separation of powers. It ensures that the judiciary serves as a check on the legislative and executive branches, preventing potential abuses of power and ensuring that laws align with constitutional principles. Gadarian (2022) contends that the court's special legitimate and political character permits citizens to expel choices they oppose this idea with as political, in this manner adversely affecting their sees of the court itself. Since courts typically exercise their authority to review the constitutionality of laws on a case-by-case basis, legal challenges must be brought before the court by individuals, groups, or entities claiming that a specific law violates constitutional rights or principles. When that happens, courts have the power to issue declaratory judgments, stating whether a law is constitutional or unconstitutional. Such judgments have precedential value, guiding future interpretations of similar legal issues.

Judicial review involves interpreting the law and applying its provisions to specific legal questions. Courts may use various methods of constitutional interpretation, such as textual analysis, historical interpretation, and consideration of evolving societal values. In many democracies, the judiciary serves as the final arbiter of constitutional disputes. Once a court issues a decision on the constitutionality of a law, that decision is generally binding and cannot be overturned by the legislative or executive branches without a constitutional amendment. Therefore, the power of judicial review contributes to a delicate balance of powers within a democratic system: while it empowers the judiciary to protect individual

rights and uphold constitutional principles, it also requires the judiciary to exercise its authority judiciously and avoid encroaching on the legislative and executive domains (McGann and Latner, 2006).

The research argues that The investigate contends that by empowering the legal to check the activities of the official and administrative branches, judicial review upholds the rule of law, protects individual rights, and ensures that all branches operate within the constitutional framework, contributing to the resilience and stability of the democratic system. When the courts act as impartial arbiters and uphold the rights of citizens, it reinforces the credibility and legitimacy of the judicial branch, contributing to the overall stability of the democratic system. This ensures that power is distributed among the different branches, creating a system of mutual checks. As explained by Giles, Blackstone, and Vining (2008), by providing judicial review, courts respond directly to changes in public opinion, aligning the preferences of the court with those of the public.

Against this backdrop, questions surrounding the power of judicial review have taken center stage, posing a fundamental inquiry into whether courts, through the exercise of this power, contribute to the enhancement or potential erosion of democratic principles. As the role of courts continues to evolve and adapt to contemporary challenges, the intricate connection between majority rule and minority rights remains a compelling and crucial area of inquiry within political and legal scholarship (Bazelon, 2023). There is however a focal point of debate about the validity of public trust, which results in that the recognition of the part of the court is a debated aspect of political systems. According to this argument, the core of every democracy is the principle that governments derive their authority from winning elections, which possess governments with the trust embedded by the people.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Protecting Individual Rights

The second duty of courts is to protect individual rights and interests that have been violated, providing the legal avenue for individuals to seek justice when they believe their rights have been violated. When individuals believe that their rights have been violated, they can bring cases before the courts, seeking redress and legal remedies courts act as a check on the power of the government, ensuring that it does not overstep its bounds and violate the rights of citizens. This role becomes particularly crucial in times of crisis when there may be a temptation to compromise individual liberties for the sake of security or other public interests.

It is commonly agreed that courts play a vital role in interpreting and upholding the law, including the authority to review the constitutionality of laws. This power is a key element of the system of checks and balances within democratic governance. The inclusion of rights and liberties in the constitutions of democratic countries reflects a commitment to protecting the inherent dignity and freedoms of individuals within the legal and political framework of the nation. Courts, through their decisions, set precedents that guide future legal interpretations, and engage in judicial activism, where they actively interpret and apply the law to protect individual rights. This may involve expanding or clarifying the scope of constitutional rights to adapt to evolving societal norms and values. Bowie (2021) explains this by asserting that it is the court's duty to interpret the law, and justices should adhere to their own interpretation of what the law dictates. Courts are viewed as pivotal actors in political systems and are entrusted with the critical responsibilities of upholding democratic order, addressing public policy questions, and safeguarding individual rights from potential violations by the state. As explained by Daly (2017), dissatisfaction with court decisions can

erode public trust, emphasizing the importance of maintaining a delicate balance between judicial authority and public legitimacy.

This perception is rooted in the crucial role that courts play in interpreting and upholding constitutional rights, ensuring that the actions of the government and other entities do not infringe upon the fundamental rights of individuals (White, 2000). Many countries have constitutions that explicitly outline the rights and liberties of individuals, and courts are tasked with interpreting these constitutional provisions and ensuring that laws and government actions align with the principles enshrined in the constitution. This includes safeguarding rights such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the right to privacy. Within this role, Fink (2020) explains that major concern is to ensure legal accountability for fundamental rights violations that occur in the context of government's activities.

These constitutional provisions serve as foundational documents that establish the framework for governance, define the relationship between the government and its citizens, and articulate fundamental principles that safeguard individual rights. Constitutions often include a specific section known as the Bill of Rights or Fundamental Rights. This section enumerates and guarantees a range of rights and liberties considered essential for the protection and well-being of individuals. Examples of such rights include freedom of speech, freedom of religion, the right to a fair trial, and protection against unreasonable searches and seizures. Additionally, constitutions recognize unremunerated rights, acknowledging that individuals possess rights not explicitly mentioned but inherent to human dignity and liberty. Chilton and Versteeg (2022) claim that courts often play a role in identifying and interpreting these unremunerated rights, and this role requires overcoming the conceptual challenge of identifying which legal sources should be considered constitutional and the practical challenge of quantifying those sources across jurisdictions. They explain that although constitutions establish countries' fundamental laws, identifying which legal materials are constitutional is not a straightforward task.

Constitutions distinguish between different categories of rights (Fruhstorfer and Hudson, 2022). Civil and political rights encompass freedoms related to political participation and protection from government actions, while economic and social rights pertain to aspects such as the right to work, education, and a standard of living. Further, constitutions are dynamic documents that can be amended to reflect evolving societal values and needs. Amendments to the constitution may involve the addition, modification, or removal of specific rights and liberties, reflecting the changing landscape of legal and human rights discourse (Brummett, 2022). It is important to explain that constitutional rights can be classified into positive and negative rights. Positive rights require the government to act in certain ways and entail an obligation on the part of the government to provide certain services or opportunities, such as the right to education or healthcare. Negative rights require the government to refrain from acting in certain ways, involving protection against government interference or infringement, such as freedom from arbitrary arrest (Wibye. 2022).

The inclusion of rights in a constitution is not merely symbolic, since these rights are legally enforceable. Citizens can invoke constitutional protections in courts to challenge laws or government actions that violate their rights (Rogers, 2001). Constitutional courts often play a crucial role in interpreting these rights and ensuring their enforcement, as many constitutional texts draw inspiration from or align with international human rights standards. Countries often ratify international treaties and conventions that establish universal principles of human rights, and constitutional provisions may mirror or elaborate on these standards. Alvik (2020) points that the specific rights included in a constitution can vary based on cultural and historical contexts, since countries may emphasize certain rights more

prominently due to unique historical experiences, cultural values, or contemporary challenges.

The legal process allows for a fair and impartial examination of the facts, and court decisions can provide remedies, compensation, or injunctions to protect individual rights. Courts contribute to the development of legal precedents and interpretations that shape the broader landscape of human rights standards. The research argues that this role is supported by landmark court decisions often establish legal principles that influence the protection of rights not only at the national level but also within the broader international community. As a result, it is argued that legal decisions respond directly to changes in public opinion through elections, providing a mechanism by which the preferences of the court can be aligned with those of the public (Giles, Blackstone and Vining, 2008).

Judicialization of Politics

The concept that the court holds the ultimate authority on constitutional matters did not originate with contemporary policies (Snyder, 2022). Instead, the judicialization of politics results from a fundamental shift in issues related to democratic legitimacy, encompassing both institutional development and political culture (Filgueiras, 2013). The global expansion of judicial power is one of the most significant developments in recent years, and scholars have identified this trend as the “judicialization of politics. This trend results from the growing interconnectedness of societies, the ease of information exchange, and the recognition of shared legal principles and human rights standards across borders (Hirschl, 2023).

This trend emphasizes the fact that globalization has led to a heightened awareness of universal human rights and principles of international law. Globalization has contributed significantly to a heightened awareness of universal human rights by facilitating the exchange of information, creating interconnected networks, and fostering a sense of shared responsibility among the international community. Lima (2020) explains that the interactions between the legal and political systems has been strengthened through global judicial review, with the transference to courts of themes that define and divide a political system. The interconnected nature of globalization has contributed to a collective recognition of the importance of upholding and protecting human rights for all individuals, regardless of their location, and has empowered individuals to see themselves as global citizens with a shared responsibility for human rights. Consequently, courts in different countries are paying increasing attention to legal decisions made in other jurisdictions and often cite and consider decisions made by their counterparts when interpreting and applying human rights norms.

In an era of globalization, the debate has taken on a global dimension. Legal and political developments in one country can influence discussions and decisions in others. Cross-border issues, such as human rights and international law, further contribute to the complexity of the debate. Fikfak (2020) appears how the European Court of Human Rights ensured against human rights infringement. Elsuwege and Gremmelprez (2020) clarify that the run the show of law to ensure human rights is one of the center protected values of the EU legitimate arrange. Concurring to the OECD (2021), believe within the courts and the lawful framework is emphatically related with discernments of the autonomy of the courts. This see is bolstered by Lee (2015), as he clarifies that it is broadly concurred that disappointment with American Preeminent Court choices hurts the court’s standing among the open and so court execution influences authenticity. Kerr and Wahman (2021) bolster this point of view, looking at the court's part in Africa, where lawful roads for challenging decisions upgrade race judgment and believe in political teach in the midst of allegations of extortion and

control. Agreeing to their discoveries, legitimate roads for challenging decisions may upgrade race judgment and believe in political educate.

The dependence on courts for addressing open approach questions and political discussions could be a central wonder in modern majority rule governments whereas debating a characteristic struggle between lion's share control and minority rights Since the social and political perceivability of legal frameworks has expanded over the globe (Filgueiras, 2013). De Sousa Santos (2000) clarifies that as the social and political perceivability of legal frameworks has expanded over the globe, the need of striking adjust in law-based administration includes all nations and bridges topographical borders.

Globalization continues to evolve and the interconnection of diverse cultures and communities grows, with technological advancements, increased travel, international trade, and educational exchanges contributing to this cultural exchange. The intricate relationship between the role of the court, the dynamics of majority rule, and the protection of minority rights, underscores the complex nature of every democratic governance, since courts are perceived as central players in any political system, as their duty is to maintain a functioning democratic order (Daly, 2017).

For that reason, challenges related to cultural appropriation and homogenization must be navigated on a global level, to ensure a respectful and inclusive global community. The future of democracy and the role of courts in a globalized world are shaped by technological advancements, global governance challenges, judicial independence, and responses to populist movements. The judiciary's ability to balance political powers with individual rights must address global issues and maintain public trust. International cooperation, inclusivity and adaptability within legal systems are key considerations for navigating the complexities of an interconnected world.

Globalization has driven to expanded mindfulness of human rights issues. Erhardt, Wamsler and Freitag (2020) appear that civic national character is related with the next bolster for popular government and lower bolster for dictator administrations, with specific suggestions for the survival of vote-based system in times of emergencies. This energetic relationship has impelled progressing discourses over the world, fueled by the increased perceivability of legal frameworks universally. The worldwide talk on the court's part in political choices has started differentiating viewpoints among analysts. Strother Kushner Gadarian (2022) contend that not at all like other branches of government that are explicitly and absolutely political, the court is interesting cross breed lawful and political character permits citizens to rebate court choices they oppose this idea with as a political which at that point in turn harms their sees of the court itself. Prendergast (2019) inspected the need of courts to intercede within the forming of political forms, and concluded that the legal part is in ensuring majority rule government from populism of developments that claim to be law based in communicating what the individuals need, against the political foundation, since majority rule governments confront dangers of being controlled towards dictatorship. As verbalized by Navarrete and Castillo-Ortiz (2020), the soundness of a vote-based system pivots on worthy levels of open back for majority rule teach. This point of view adjusts with Lee's (2015) statement that disappointment with lawful choices impacts the court's standing among the open, subsequently affecting its authenticity around the world.

CONCLUSION

The research underscores the divergent opinions regarding the court's role in upholding constitutional review by rejecting legislative and executive actions conflicting with constitutional norms. The central question revolves around whether this power is vital in a

democratic society or poses a threat by allowing the court to override decisions made by elected representatives of the public.

The perception of the court's role in democracy is a multifaceted and debated aspect of political systems globally. The research illuminates the intricacies of this discourse, emphasizing the need for a careful equilibrium that upholds democratic principles, protects individual rights, and maintains public trust. The evolving landscape of democracy, influenced by different electoral systems, diverse cultural contexts, and changing societal values, necessitates ongoing reflection and adaptation to ensure the resilience and effectiveness of democratic governance.

The research sheds light on the global impact of the court's role, particularly in debates about the role and limits of free speech in democracies. This illustrates the real-world implications of the theoretical discussions, emphasizing the court's centrality in shaping public discourse and democratic norms. The conclusion should be that the ongoing debate surrounding the role of courts in democracy reflects a dynamic struggle for power between the legislative and judicial branches, with courts emerging as central players in political systems globally. The perception of their role is multifaceted, encompassing the maintenance of democratic order, the resolution of public policy issues, and the protection of individual rights violated by state power.

Research on this topic reveals contrasting views. Some argue for the supremacy of courts over legislators, emphasizing the need for judicial independence to counterbalance potential authoritarian tendencies within governments. Conversely, there are perspectives supporting the authority of elected legislators, framing the role of courts as contributing to the judicialization of politics. A mediating view emphasizes the court's role in protecting democratic systems and human rights, emphasizing the importance of public support for democratic institutions.

The ongoing global debate over the court's authority in political decisions reveals diverse perspectives that encapsulate the challenges and opportunities inherent in maintaining a democratic order. Courts are perceived as central players in political systems and are entrusted with a dual function crucial to democratic governance. They act as a check on the exercise of state power, providing a safeguard against potential abuses by the legislative and executive branches, while simultaneously they are tasked with the protection of individual rights and interests, serving as a bulwark against violations that might occur within the democratic framework.

A pivotal aspect of this debate revolves around the separation of powers, questioning whether decisions should be made solely by elected politicians or whether judiciaries should act as restraints protecting minority rights and the rule of law. The courts' interpretation of the law, aligned with their own understanding and, to an extent, public opinion, contributes to their legitimacy. However, challenges arise when citizens perceive court decisions as overly political, potentially eroding trust in the judicial system. The power of constitutional review, allowing courts to reject legislative and executive actions conflicting with constitutional norms, raises a critical question: The question raised by this research, therefore, is: does this power enhance democratic society or threaten it by allowing courts to override decisions made by elected representatives?

REFERENCES

- Alvik, I. (2020). The Justification of Privilege in International Investment Law: Preferential Treatment of Foreign Investors as a Problem of Legitimacy, *European Journal of International Law*, Volume 31, Issue 1

- Barroso, L. R. (2019). Counter majoritarian, Representative, and Enlightened: The Roles of Constitutional Courts in Democracies. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, Volume 67, Issue 1
- Bazelon, E. (2023). How Much Power Should the Courts Have? The New York Time Magazine, April 14. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/14/magazine/courts-power-government.html>
- Brummett, A. L. (2022). Should Positive Claims of Conscience Receive the Same Protection as Negative Claims of Conscience? Clarifying the Asymmetry Debate. *The Journal of Clinical Ethics*. Volume 31, Number 2
- Chilton, A., & Versteeg, M. (2022). Small-c constitutional rights, *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, Volume 20, Issue 1
- Daly, T. G. (2017). *The alchemists: Courts as democracy-builders in contemporary thought*. Published online by Cambridge University Press
- Dershowitz, A. (2023). Why is the World Obsessed with Israeli Judicial Reform? The Jerusalem Strategic Tribune. <https://jstribune.com/dershowitz-why-is-the-world-obsessed-with-israeli-judicial-reform/>
- De Sousa Santos & Boaventura (2008). The World Social Forum and the Global Left. *Politics & Society*, 2008, 2
- Durbach, A., Reinecke, I., & Dargan, L. (2020). Enabling democracy: the role of public interest litigation in sustaining and preserving the separation of powers. *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, Volume 26, Issue 2
- Elsuwege & Gremmelpez (2020). Protecting the Rule of Law in the EU Legal Order: A Constitutional Role for the Court of Justice. *European Constitutional Law Review*. Volume 16. Issue 1
- Erhardt, J., Wamsler, S. & Freitag, M. (2020). National identity between democracy and autocracy: a comparative analysis of 24 countries. *European Political Science Review*. Volume 13. Issue 1
- Fikfak, V. (2020). Non-pecuniary damages before the European Court of Human Rights: Forget the victim; it's all about the state. *Leiden Journal of International Law* Volume 33 Issue 2
- Ferrín, M., & Hernández, E. (2021). Preferences for consensus and majoritarian democracy: long- and short-term influences. *European Political Science Review*. Volume 13 Issue 2
- Filgueiras, F. (2013). Perceptions on Justice, the Judiciary and Democracy. *Brazilian Political Science Review*
<https://www.scielo.br/j/bpsr/a/sZZXKhgSC4RvRwx8jdSSzsx/?format=pdf&lang=en>
- Fruhstorfer, A., & Hudson, A. (2022). Majorities for Minorities: Participatory Constitution Making and the Protection of Minority Rights. *Political Research Quarterly*, 75(1)
- Geissel, B. & Michels, A. (2018). Participatory developments in majoritarian and consensus democracies. *Representation - Journal of Representative Democracy*. Volume 54, 2018 - Issue 2
- Giles, M. W., Blackstone, B. & Vining, R. L. (2008). The Supreme Court in American Democracy: Unraveling the Linkages between Public Opinion and Judicial Decision Making. *The Journal of Politics*. Volume 70, Number 2
- Greene, J. (2008). Giving the Constitution to the Courts. *The Yale Law Journal*. Vol. 117, No. 5
- Hirschl, R. (2023). The Global Expansion of Judicial Power. *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Judicial Behavior* (Lee Epstein, Gunnar Grendstad, Urška Šadl, and Keren Weinshall, eds., Oxford University Press)

- Kerr, N. K., & Wahman, M. (2019). Electoral Rulings and Public Trust in African Courts and Elections. *Comparative Politics* 53(2)
- Lee, F. E. (2015). "How Party Polarization Affects Governance." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18
- Leiter, B. (2020). The Roles of Judges in Democracies: a realistic view. *REI - REVISTA ESTUDOS INSTITUCIONAIS*, 6(2)
- Lima, F. D. S. (2020). Protecting Political Rights or Interfering in the Political Arena? *Humanities and Rights Global Network Journal*. Vol 2. No. 2
- McGann, A. J. & Latner, M. (2006). Consensus Without Veto-Players: Testing Theories of Consensual Democracy. The Center for the Study of Democracy at University of California
- Navarrete, R., & Castillo Ortiz, P. J. (2020). Constitutional courts and citizens' perceptions of judicial systems in Europe. Constitutional courts and citizens' perceptions of judicial systems in Europe. *Comparative European Politics*, 18(2)
- OECD (2021). Trust Survey Report. <https://www.oecd.org/governance/trust-in-government/>
- Prendergast, D. (2019). The judicial role in protecting democracy from populism. *German Law Journal*, 20
- Rogers, J. R. (2001). Information and Judicial Review: A Signaling Game of Legislative-Judicial Interaction. *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 45, No. 1
- Sanchez Urribarri, R. A. (2018). Courts between Democracy and Hybrid Authoritarianism: Evidence from the Venezuelan Supreme Court. *Law & Social Inquiry*. Volume 36, Issue 4
- Staton, J. K., & Vanberg, G. (2008). The Value of Vagueness: Delegation, Defiance, and Judicial Opinions. *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 52, No. 3
- Strother, L. & Kushner Gadarian, S. (2022). Public Perceptions of the Supreme Court: How Policy Disagreement Affects Legitimacy. *The Forum*. Volume 20 Issue 1
- Synder, B. (2022). Opinion | The Supreme Court Has Too Much Power and Liberals Are to Blame. *Politico*, July 27. <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2022/07/27/supreme-court-power-liberals-democrats-00048155>
- Wibye, J. V. (2022). Beyond Acts and Omissions - Distinguishing Positive and Negative Duties at the European Court of Human Rights. *Hum Rights Rev* 23
- White G. E. (2000). *The Constitution and the New Deal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Wolterstorff, N., & Cuneo, T. (2012). Liberal Democracy as Equal Political Voice. In: *Understanding Liberal Democracy: Essays in Political Philosophy*. Nicholas Wolterstorff, Terence Cuneo (ed.)